

© 2011 Jong-Hyun Lee

INVESTIGATING THE INFLUENCES OF SOCIAL STUDIES METHODS COURSES ON
PRESERVICE TEACHERS WITH A FOCUS ON ISSUES OF DIVERSITY AND SOCIAL
JUSTICE: THREE CASE STUDIES

BY
JONG-HYUN LEE

DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Elementary Education
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2011

Urbana, Illinois

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Marilyn Johnston-Parsons, Chair
Professor Susan Noffke
Professor Jeanne Connell
Professor Ann Bishop

Abstract

Issues of diversity and social justice are critical for teacher education as the student population in the United States becomes increasingly diverse ethnically, racially, socially, and linguistically. It has been traditionally assumed that social studies, more than other curricular areas, should deal with these issues, especially in raising good citizens. A review of the research on social studies methods courses, however, indicates that few studies have examined the impact of social studies methods courses on student teaching practices. This study focused on the impact of social studies methods courses on student teaching, looking particularly at issues of diversity and social justice.

The objective of this study was to investigate how preservice teachers who took a social studies methods course in their senior year of a teacher education program incorporated their learning from that course into their 10-week student teaching practicum the following semester. This study examined two research questions: (a) What are the influences of a social studies methods course on preservice teachers' understandings, especially their perspectives regarding the issues of diversity and social justice? and (b) How do preservice teachers incorporate their learning from the social studies methods course into their student teaching of social studies in schools, especially in addressing issues of diversity and social justice?

This study was situated in the social studies methods courses at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC) and in the preservice teachers' 10-week student teaching practicum. The participants were three preservice teachers who were enrolled in the 1-8 teacher education program at the university. The data collected for this study included formal and informal interviews with the participants, observation of the participants' student teaching classes, and examination of lesson plans and other teaching documents. Based on these data, each

participant's learning from social studies methods course and student teaching practices were analyzed as a case study.

The findings of this study showed that student teachers are capable of incorporating not only practical teaching methods but also new theoretical concepts learned from methods courses into their social studies student teaching. Thus, these findings suggest that a social studies methods course that includes theoretical concepts and teaching strategies can help students change their previous negative experiences from social studies or develop new understandings.

The findings also showed, however, that these student teachers had some difficulties incorporating their new learning from the methods course into their student teaching. Two participants only minimally included issues of diversity and social justice in their lessons, the third participant purposefully articulated these issues in her lesson. This latter participant, who demonstrated the most attention to issues of diversity and social justice, had previous intra-cultural experiences, but the other two participants did not. Thus, the findings here may suggest some advantage to giving priority to people who have had intercultural experience when recruiting teacher candidates, if we want to be more successful in helping student teachers develop a commitment to teaching for social justice.

The findings further suggest the importance of professional development for cooperating teachers, especially related to matters of diversity and social justice. While all three participants in this study stated that they received useful help or support from their cooperating teachers, they also all expressed that they had not received any help in addressing issues of diversity and social justice. This finding suggests that professional development for inservice teachers may be necessary if we want student teachers to better learn to address diversity and social justice during their student teaching practicum.

In the discussion chapter, I use Wenger's (1998) concepts of learning, meaning, and social practice to interpret the three participants' experiences related to the social studies methods course and their student teaching practices. In addition, some suggestions for teacher education programs, particularly related to social studies methods courses and to teaching issues of diversity and social justice, are discussed.

Key word: preservice teacher education, social studies methods course, issues of diversity and social justice

Dedicated to my mother

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Chapter 2 My Theoretical Position and Literature Review	17
Chapter 3 Methods	73
Chapter 4 Description of the Social Studies Methods Course	101
Chapter 5 Findings	123
Chapter 6 Cross-Case Analysis	237
Chapter 7 Discussion	253
References	271
Appendix A Protocol for First Interview	283
Appendix B Protocol for Second Interview	286
Appendix C Protocol for Third Interview	289
Appendix D Protocol for Interview with Cooperating Teacher	291
Appendix E Syllabus of Social Studies Methods Course	293

Chapter 1

Introduction

This dissertation study has evolved from my interests related to three different issues. My first interest is in teacher education. I believe in the axiom “the quality of education cannot surpass the quality of teachers.” To me, this axiom seems especially relevant to the reform movement in the Korean educational contexts. Although there have been continuous reform movements in K-12 schooling in Korea, such as emphasizing constructivism or democratic education, little change or reform has occurred in the field of teacher education. Rather, the transmission of subject matter knowledge to prospective teachers, which has traditionally been emphasized, is still receiving a higher priority than other concerns in the field of Korean teacher education. The simple belief behind this tradition is that if teachers know the subject matter knowledge competently, they will have no problem promoting student learning. Although this myth has been challenged by some Korean scholars who advocate for the sociocultural aspects of human learning, the tradition is still prevalent in preservice teacher education in Korea. My contention is that in order to institute educational reform in K-12 schooling in Korea, teacher education itself must first be reformed. For example, if the issues of diversity and social justice related to multicultural education in a multicultural, diverse society are to be properly taught to K-12 students, teachers first need to learn about and fully understand them through their teacher education programs.

My second interest is in the changing demographics in Korean Society. Korea has until recently generally been regarded as a racially homogenous nation. However, it now

appears that this view is no longer accurate. Korea is now experiencing demographic changes because of the influx of both migrant-laborers and international marriage. According to a Korean government report, as of 2007, the percentage of legal foreign residents is about 1.5% (Jung, 2007). One may simply think that 1.5% is relatively small, but if we consider that today's world is continuously globalizing due to the use of the Internet and easy mobility between nations, it is reasonable to conclude that the demographic change that Korea is currently experiencing will continue. Indeed, compared to past rates, the number of migrants-laborers and the incidence of international marriage are increasing in Korea. It is expected that within a few years, there will be a sizeable number of elementary students for whom at least one parent is not of Korean heritage. In short, it is safe to say that Korea is beginning the process to becoming a multiethnic, multicultural society.

Based on this current change in demographics, some Korean educators have recently begun to address issues related to multicultural education. For example, Chang (2003) proposed several suggestions for Korean teacher education curricula based on multicultural education. However, although the article summarized well the history of multicultural education in the U.S., her six suggestions were mainly related to general aspects of teacher education, and did not deal directly with either democratic education or multicultural education. A second example of a Korean educator exploring multicultural issues is Oh's (2005) case study of Kosian (Korean-Asian) children. Conducting in-depth interviews with Kosian elementary school children's mothers and their classroom teachers, he found that the lack of language learning competency had a negative effect on the

children's identities and personal relationships, and he suggested "developing supplemental programs, supporting systems such as teachers' training and relevant research for Kosian children" (p. 83). I foresee an imperative for the field of teacher education in Korea to make a concerted effort to prepare future teachers for the changing demographics of Korean society. In particular, I am convinced that this effort needs to take the direction of advocating "social justice and human rights for all people" in a diverse society *if* that society is really to become more just and democratic.

Finally, my third interest is related to the goals of education. Regarding the ultimate goal of education, I embrace Dewey's (1916) ideas proposed in his famous book *Democracy and Education*. In particular, his arguments that democracy is "primarily a mode of associated living," (p. 87) and "the school must itself be a community life in all which that implies" (p. 358) are what I believe education should encompass. This contrasts sharply with merely focusing on exams and scores. In short, his ideas of education for democracy, for associated living, and for community life are what I want to adopt as the goals of education. While there is no doubt that all subjects in education need to support the idea of education for democracy, the main content of social studies, more than any other subject, focuses on democracy and multiculturalism. When social studies is taught with attention to the issues of diversity and social justice in multicultural society, students can learn and understand how important these issues are for sustaining and developing a more just and democratic society.

My current dissertation study is a synthesis of these three issues—teacher education, the changing demographics of Korea, and the goals of education. I will focus on

examining how a social studies methods course in preservice teacher education can help preservice teachers develop perspectives toward diversity and social justice. Although this study is conducted in the U.S. educational context for practical reasons, I am confident that this study will yield insights into how to help Korean preservice teachers develop rich perspectives about diversity and social justice.

A Rational for the Study

The rational for this dissertation study relies on two currently important issues in the field of teacher education, which are related to issues of diversity and social justices— (a) the necessity of focus on issues of diversity and social justice in teacher education and (b) the necessity of research on social studies methods courses with a focus on issues of diversity and social justice.

The necessity of focus on issues of diversity and social justice in teacher education. Currently, as the student populations in the United States are becoming, and will continue to be increasingly diverse ethnically, racially, socially, or linguistically, the issues of diversity and social justice in education have received much more attention than ever before. In fact, the issues of diversity and social justice have become one of central themes in the field of teacher education in the United States (Cochran-Smith, 1995). Accordingly, one can find very easily significant documents and articles that address these issues in the field of teacher education. For example, in part VI of *Handbook of research on teacher education* (Sikula, 1996) dealt with the issues of diversity and social justice such as “selecting and preparing culturally competent teachers for urban schools,” “multicultural

education: landscape for reform in the twenty-first century,” “equity challenges,” and “teachers socialization for culturally diversity.”

Another example of the issue of diversity can be found in the 2002 edition of *Professional Standards for the Accreditation of Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education*, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE, 2002). Among the six professional standards of NCATE, the main topic of standard 4 is “diversity.” It is said that one of the goals of standard 4 is the development of educators who can help all students learn and who can teach from multicultural and global perspectives that draw on the histories, experiences, and representations of students from diverse cultural backgrounds. To achieve this goal, it suggests that whether they teach in areas with great diversity or not, student teachers must develop knowledge of diversity, dispositions that respect and value differences, and skills for working in diverse settings. In addition, it proposes that student teachers must have extensive and substantive field experiences and clinical practices that can require them to reflect on their observations and practices in schools and communities with students and families from diverse cultural groups (NCATE, 2002). Indeed, considering the significance of diversity issues in education in the United States, one of the major issues in teacher education is the need to help all teachers acquire the attitudes, knowledge, skills, and disposition needed to work effectively with culturally diverse student populations. This necessity requires teacher education programs to focus directly on the issue of how to prepare teachers for culturally diverse students.

If we look at the history of teacher education in U.S, the task of preparing all

teachers to teach a diverse student body is not a new concern in U.S teacher education. For example, in 1969, the widely publicized task force report of the National Institute for Advanced Study in Teaching Disadvantaged Youth, *Teachers for the Real World*, Smith clearly identified the failure of teacher education programs to prepare teachers to teach diverse students. By identifying the problem that “racial, class, and ethnic bias can be found in every aspect of current teacher education program,” this report called for major overhaul of teacher education program in terms of their approaches to diversity and equity (as cited in Zeichner & Hoeft, 1996).

However, prior to these recommendations, most American teacher education program had started to acknowledge, in principle, the importance of preparing teachers for cultural diversity. The evidence, however, suggests that in practice not has changed much. This means that still many teacher education programs have continued to represent traditional perspectives, which are designed to prepare middle-class, European American candidates to teach middle-class, European American students in mainstream schools (Gay, 2005). Moreover, while currently most teacher education program have started to include the course of dealing with diversity issues by accepting NCATE (2002) requirements, there have been little research of whether teacher programs that focused on issues of diversity actually are influencing students’ teaching practices.

Thus, it is worthwhile to study whether preservice teacher education programs that intend to prepare to preservice teachers to teach culturally diverse students have an influence on their teaching practices. In particular, my dissertation study focuses on how a social studies methods course in one preservice teacher education program attempted to

help preservice teachers learn to teach culturally diverse students.

The necessity of research on social studies methods courses with a focus on issues of diversity and social justice. The social studies methods course is one of several methods courses in teacher education program in most universities. During preservice teacher education programs, social studies methods courses can provide opportunities for preservice teachers to learn about important concepts related to diversity, equity, and social justice. The expectation is that they will be able to address these concepts both in their student teaching and their teaching later on.

Reviews of the research on social studies methods courses include several scholars who have examined how students' learning experiences in social studies method courses have been incorporated into student teaching (Adler, 1991; Clift & Brady, 2005). For example, Fehn and Koeppen (1998) investigated secondary education student teachers' responses to a document-based social studies methods course and their use of document-based instruction during their student teaching. Fehn and Koeppen reported that all 11 participants in this study incorporated document-based instruction into their student teaching and maintained a positive attitude toward the use of document-based instruction.

Dinkelman's (2000) social studies course focused on democratic education and he investigated the development of critical reflection and critical reflective teaching among three secondary social studies preservice teachers who took his course during their student teaching semester. The findings of this study showed that all three participants showed evidence of understanding and practicing critical reflection and began to develop a somewhat stronger emphasis on democratic education. He did not, however, find

connections to critical democratic citizenship or any change in the students' views concerning the purposes for teaching social studies.

Although both Fehn and Keoppen's study (1998) and Dinkelman's study (2000) reported generally positive results about social studies methods courses, their research foci were in terms of reflective practice or document-based instruction in participants' student teaching practicum. Neither study examined the issue of multicultural education or issues of diversity and social justice related to social studies methods courses. In short, a review of the research on social studies methods courses indicates that although there have been efforts to link social studies methods courses and their impact on student teaching, few studies have examined how the impact of social studies methods courses related to multicultural education is incorporated into student teaching experiences. This lack of research provides a justification for this study to focus on the impact of social studies methods courses on student teaching in terms of issues of diversity and social justice.

Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

The main purpose of this dissertation study is to examine how preservice teachers who take a social studies methods course in their senior year of a teacher education program incorporate the learning from that course into their 10-week student teaching practicum the following semester, especially in terms of issues of diversity and social justice.

Based on the main purpose of the study, this study examines two sets of research questions:

- a. What are the influences of a social studies methods course on preservice teachers' understandings?
 - i. What are the most important learnings for them from this course?
 - ii. How do they develop or change their perspectives about the purposes of social studies for students?
 - iii. How do they develop or change their perspectives regarding the issues of diversity and social justice?
- b. How do preservice teachers incorporate their learning from the social studies methods course into their student teaching of social studies in schools?
 - i. Is there evidence that they incorporate their learning from the methods course into their student teaching? If so, how?
 - ii. Is there evidence that they incorporate their learning from the methods course related to issues of diversity and social justice into their student teaching? If so, how?

Theoretical Framework of the Study-- *Communities of Practice* (1998) by Wenger

For a theoretical framework of this dissertation study, I employed “a social theory of learning” by Wenger. In particular, his idea of “community of practice” will be used as a tool for the interpretation of my data in chapter 7. In the following, I will briefly summarize *Community of Practice* (1998), a book by Wenger, in which his social theory of learning is explained.

In *Communities of Practice*, Wenger (1998) presents “a social theory of learning” that suggests engagement in social practice is the fundamental process by which we learn and become who we are. As the foundation of his theory, he lists four premises related to what matters about learning and the nature of knowledge, knowing, and knowers: (a) We

are social beings; (b) knowledge is a matter of competence with respect to valued enterprise; (c) knowing is a matter of participating in the pursuit of such enterprise, that is, of active engagement in the world; and (d) meaning is our ability to experience the world and our engagement with it as meaningful—this is ultimately what learning is to produce (p. 4). Based on these four premises, his social theory of learning emphasizes learning as a process of social participation. In order to take account of this point, throughout the book, he explores the interconnection among the issue of meaning, social practice, community, and identity. Although these four concepts are interchangeable in relation to learning, each has a particular connection to the learning process—for example, meaning construes learning as experience, social practice construes learning as doing, community construes learning as belonging, and identity construes learning as becoming (p. 5).

As a sociocultural theorist, Wenger works against the either/or approach that characterizes dichotomous thinking. Wenger argues for a more interactive and integrative approach in his analysis of learning. Thus, although he borrows from both theories of situated experiences and the theories of social structures within the tradition of social theory, his primary unit of analysis is neither the individual nor social institutions. Instead, he analyzes “communities of practice” where people pursue shared enterprise over time. A community of practice is the prime context in which people can work out common sense through mutual engagement (p. 47). Within this community of practice, a group of people shares a concern about their practice, deepening their knowledge and expertise about the practice by interacting on an ongoing basis.

In sum, Wenger re-thinks the concept of learning by placing the focus on

participation. Traditionally, learning is regarded as an individual process. In contrast, Wenger states that learning is fundamentally a social phenomenon which occurs in the context of our lived experiences of participation in the world. As such, learning is an integral part of our everyday lives, and is part of our participation in our communities and organizations: (a) for individuals, learning is an issue of engaging in the practices of their communities; (b) for communities, learning is an issue of refining their practice and ensuring new generations of members; and (c) for organizations, learning is an issue of sustaining the interconnected communities of practice through which an organization knows what it knows and thus becomes effective and valuable as an organization (p. 8).

Adopting the perspectives of social learning theory by Wegner, my analysis and interpretation of students' learning in this study will deal with the ways in which the social studies methods course has encouraged them to have "educative experiences" (Dewey, 1938) for their learning. In particular, when I interpret the data in Chapter 7, Wenger's concepts of "learning and meaning" and "learning and practice" related to the learning process will be used as a tool of data interpretation.

Overview of Literature Reviews

Three different sets of literature reviews were used for setting up this study in chapter 2. One was for providing an explanation of my theoretical position related to democratic teacher education. The other two were reviews of studies on the prejudice reduction approach and the equity pedagogy approach in preservice teacher education, and reviews of studies on social studies methods courses and their impact on student teachers.

In the first section in chapter 2, my theoretical position for democratic teacher education with a focus on diversity and social justice is described. Drawing on the work of Cochran-Smith (2001, 2004) and Nieto (2000, 2004), both of whom emphasize social justice in teacher education, I contend that democratic teacher education should be committed to social justice in a contemporary diverse society. In short, my point here is that without trying to accomplish social justice in a multicultural, diverse society, authentic democracy cannot be sustained and developed. This point regarding democratic teacher education with a focus on diversity and social justice will be used as a significant criterion for analyzing how social studies methods courses can be helpful to student teachers in understanding diversity and social justice in this study.

Related to emphasizing my point on diversity and social justice in teacher education, in the second section, I reviewed the research studies that have addressed the issue of diversity and teacher education, especially those that focused on “prejudice reduction” approach and “equity pedagogy” approach in preservice teacher education in U.S. Doing this review, I limited the scope of the review in terms of how the coursework and field experiences in preservice teacher education programs have helped student teachers in understanding issues of diversity and social justice. One critical finding from this review in terms of research trends in preservice teacher education was that, compared to research on prejudice reduction approach, little research has been done on equity pedagogy approach in preservice teacher education. Regarding this matter, my contention is that although “prejudice reduction” is clearly a necessary step in achieving the ultimate goal of democratic, multicultural education, but it is still insufficient. In order to

accomplish the ultimate goal of democratic, multicultural education—making society more just—teachers must learn to employ “equity pedagogy” approach beyond simply a “prejudice reduction” approach. As such, this study will try to examine how the social studies methods course helped the student teachers learn to use an equity pedagogy approach in their student teaching.

Finally, in the third section, I briefly reviewed the literature on the study of social studies methods courses and their impact on student teachers. The findings from this review indicated that although several studies (Angell, 1998; Dinkelman, 1999, 2000; Fehn & Koeppen, 1998) examined the impact of social studies methods courses on student teaching in terms of reflective practice or document-based instruction, few studies have examined how the impact of social studies methods courses related to multicultural education are incorporated into student teaching experiences. This fact requires the study of focusing on the impact of social studies methods courses on student teaching in terms of issues of diversity and social justice, and my study will try to focus on the impact of social studies methods courses on student teaching in terms of issues of diversity and social justice.

Significance of the Study in Current Educational Context

It is generally accepted that the subject of social studies, rather than any other subjects, among school curriculum can play a significant role in raising good citizens, especially related to the issues of diversity, equity, and social justice. Accordingly, considering the importance of learning about the issues of diversity and social justice in

contemporary society, it can be suggested that the subject social studies get more emphasis in school curricular.

However, current educational context in the United States seems not much follow this direction, even go opposite direction. In fact, under the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) movement, it appears that raising students' test scores gets high priority in school curricular, rather than focusing on helping the students learn about issues of diversity and social justice. Even in some schools, the time of teaching social studies has been reduced due to spending more time in math and sciences. In short, current schooling in the U.S. shows that the subject social studies, which primarily address the topics related to diversity and social justice, gets less attention, although issues of diversity and social justice need to get more emphasis in order to raise good citizens in contemporary diverse society. Considering this problematic situation, it is worthwhile to investigate how social studies methods course in teacher education program help the preservice teachers develop their perspectives about issues of diversity and social justice and prepare them to teach these issues to the students.

Overview of the Chapters

As said earlier, chapter 2, providing the literature review, will include an explanation of my theoretical position and two literature reviews. I will (a) describe my theoretical position for democratic teacher education with a focus on diversity and social justice, (b) review the research focused on studying prejudice reduction and equity pedagogy in preservice teacher education in the U.S., and (c) briefly review studies of social studies methods courses and their impact on student teachers.

In describing the methods of this study, chapter 3 will (a) explain the two research questions, (b) provide my position as a researcher through autobiography, (c) describe the interpretivist approach used as the theoretical frame of the study, and (d) describe the methods of the study, including the context, participants, data collection, data analysis, and ethical considerations.

Chapter 4 will provide a detailed description of the social studies methods course, one of main contexts of this study. The rationale for providing this description relies on the main purpose of this study. Since the main purpose of this study is to examine how preservice teachers who take a social studies methods course in a teacher education program incorporate their learning from the course into their 10-week student teaching practicum, it is essential to provide the detailed information of in what ways the social studies methods course prepared the preservice teachers to learn to teach the subject social studies.

Both chapter 5 and chapter 6 will present the results of data analysis based on data collection. In chapter 5, I will present the analysis of the three participants based on my two research questions; each participant will be presented as a case. Each case presentation will have three sections—(a) family and educational background, (b) influences from the social studies methods course, and (c) analysis of student teaching practices. Then, in chapter 6, a summary of the cross-case analysis will be discussed.

Finally, chapter 7, as the discussion chapter, will provide discussion about three different topics. In the first section, I will use the concepts of “learning and meaning” and “learning and practice” by Wenger (1998) to interpret the data, showing how his concepts

of learning, meaning, and social practice correspond to the three participants' experiences with the social studies methods course and their student teaching practices. Then, in the second section, based on the findings of this study, I will provide some suggestions to teacher education, particularly related to social studies methods course and to teaching issues of diversity and social justice. Finally, in the third section, I will provide some recommendations about teacher education program in Korea because this study evolved from my interests in teacher education reform and in the changing demographics in Korea.

Chapter 2

My Theoretical Position and Literature Review

This chapter is divided into three sections. In the first section, I will describe my theoretical position for democratic teacher education with a focus on diversity and social justice, especially drawing from the work of Marilyn Cochran-Smith (2001, 2004), whose main area is teacher education, and Sonia Nieto (2000, 2004), whose work focuses on multicultural and bilingual education. Then, in the second section, I will review the research literature focused on studying prejudice reduction and equity pedagogy in preservice teacher education in U.S. Finally, in the third section, I will briefly review the literature on the study of social studies methods courses and their impact on student teachers.

My Position for Democratic Teacher Education

Currently, one seemingly critical situation in the U.S. field of education is the growing demographic disparity between the student population and the teacher population: While the student body is becoming increasingly diverse ethnically, racially, socially, and linguistically, the teaching force is, and likely will continue to be, white, middle-class, and monolingual (Gay & Howard, 2000). In responding to this situation, making teacher education “multicultural” and more attentive to cultural diversity has now become one of the pressing issues in teacher preparation research, practice, and policy (Cochran-Smith, Davis, & Fries, 2004). In my view, making teachers more attentive to cultural diversity is an important issue in democratic teacher education. Thus, in this first section, in an attempt

to describe my position for democratic teacher education with a focus on diversity and social justice, I will: (a) discuss democratic teacher education; (b) state the connections between democratic education and multicultural education; and (c) describe my approach and position for democratic teacher education with a focus on social justice.

Discussion about democratic teacher education. It is certain that any discussions of democratic education and democratic teacher education in the U.S. have to involve John Dewey and his concepts of democracy and education (Michelli, 2005; Novak, 1994). In his book *Democracy and Education* (1916), Dewey well demonstrated his concepts of democracy, education, and the relationship between the two. Regarding the concept of democracy, Dewey stated that “a democracy is more than a form of government; it is primarily a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experience” (p. 87). Dewey (1927) called this “creative democracy,” by which he meant that democracy is “a way of living with others, a way of being. It has no end other than the path itself” (Parker, 2003, pp. 20-21).

Regarding the concept of education, Dewey (1916) stated that “the educational process has no end beyond itself; it is its own end, and that the educational process is one of continual reorganizing, reconstruction, transforming” (p. 50). Based on this concept of education as growth, the purpose of schooling articulated by Dewey was neither merely transmission nor imposition of knowledge on the next generation, which would merely maintain the status quo. Rather it is more related to providing transformative growth, which in turn would contribute to social change and reconstruction of the society.

Also, regarding the relationship between democracy and education, Dewey (1916) stated that “the school must itself be a community life in all which that implies” (p. 358). This sentence, as Schultz (2001) well interpreted, implies Dewey’s fundamental concept about the relationship between school and democracy—that “school should be a miniature example of the kind of democratic community Dewey envisioned for the larger society” (p. 279). By employing such a concept between school and democracy, Dewey is clearly saying that you cannot have democracy without education: “There is only one road to democracy; education” (Barber, 1992, p. 15). For Dewey, it was no doubt that in order to have “democracy—associated living” we must have education. This is why Dewey, as an advocate of democracy, always thought of education as paramount.

Several contemporary scholars embraced Dewey’s idea about democracy and education by advocating democratic education. For example, extending Dewey’s idea of “associated living,” Gutmann (1987) introduced two important dimensions into the meanings of democratic education—“principles of nonrepression and nondiscrimination” (p. 14). She suggested that these two principles should be embedded in how we use education to prepare young people for participation in democracy. Like Dewey, Barber (1992) also argued for the necessity of educated citizens, who are “women and men educated for excellence,” (p. 5) in order for true democracy to flourish. The term “educated for excellence” means having the knowledge and the competence to govern in common one’s lives. According to Barber, the meaning of democratic education is creating an aristocracy for everyone, through universal education in excellence.

Specifically, Michelli (2005) discussed what education for democracy means, and provided comprehensive perspectives of its meaning. In addition to a narrow definition that viewed teaching civic responsibilities in the legal sense such as registering and voting in elections, he added five more elements to its meaning—(a) teaching for civil responsibilities of individuals such as respect for others; (b) teaching students to understand the meanings of civil rights and liberties; (c) teaching them to understand what it means to be free and to engage in the “apprenticeship of liberty”; (d) helping them become aesthetically literate; and (e) helping them learn to make excellent judgments and to argue well for their beliefs. His contention was that all of these six elements come together in defining what teaching for democracy can be.

The imperative of democratic teacher education rests on the fact that it is a “prerequisite for democratic education,” as Davies (2002, p. 259) articulated. In other words, if we are going to carry out democratic education in classrooms and have democratic schools, it is certain that we need those teachers who have the knowledge, skills, and attitudes for developing democratic ways of educating (Novak, 1994). Teachers need preparation to teach democratic education, and they need to have experience with democratic education throughout their teacher education programs.

As the practice of democratic education in classrooms and schools has taken many different forms such as facilitating class meetings (Wolk, 1998) or empowering students’ voices (Wade, 1999), educators have suggested many different processes and methods that support democratic teacher education. While some educators have used service learning projects for learning to live and participate in a democracy (Keiser, 2005; Lucas, 2005),

others have employed the practice of collaboration and cooperation within school/university partnerships in their teacher education programs (Wilson & Davidson, 2005), and still others have emphasized the commitment to dialogue in teacher education (Ayers, 1994; SooHoo & Wilson, 1994). Also, regarding the process and the direction of democratic teacher education, while Martin (2005) emphasized critical thinking for democracy and social justice in teacher education, Zeichner (1993) argued for teacher development that is connected to the promotion of equity and social justice in democratic societies. Certainly, all of these processes and methods are significant elements of democratic teacher education.

Connecting democratic education to multicultural education. Several scholars have discussed a tension or chasm between democratic education, specifically democratic citizenship education, and multicultural education (Kaltsounis, 1997; Parker, 2001). For example, Parker (2001) suggested that in the field of multicultural education, racial and ethnic diversity receives much attention, but little attention is paid to the construction of the overarching political community that is needed to secure and nurture this diversity; likewise, the field of citizenship education attends to the overarching political community but pays little attention to diversity and inequality. However, Parker contended that this resulting gap between multicultural education and citizenship education must be resolved, since it is “not only miseducative but incoherent” (p. 109). To resolve this problem, he suggested that democratic citizenship education needs to embrace the important value of diversity to unity—that is, diversity protects liberty, and causes liberty by assuring a critique of the dominant culture and practices. Parker clearly emphasizes the connection between

democratic education and multicultural education by saying “liberty cannot be protected without diversity” (p. 115).

Gay (1997) also discussed the crucial relationship between multicultural education and democratic education. Specifically, she suggested the similar missions between two. According to Gay, the missions of democratic education rest on such a fact—in the U.S., democracy as an institution, ethic, and political system is “a social contract of the people, by the people, and for the people, and education is instrumental to its creation, survival, and vitality” (p. 6). She also contended that the missions and critical concerns of multicultural education are situated well within the fundamental core of democratic tradition, since it evokes the rights of all people, especially the rights of people in disenfranchised groups, to protest, resist, and change practices that violate democratic values such as equity and social justice.

In addition to similar missions, Gay (1997) also discussed the same perspectives between multicultural education and democratic education. She suggested that education for democracy involves more than merely transmitting past experiences, heritages, and contributions to students; rather it is “teaching students to recognize the skills and the need for mastering them in order to transform society” (p. 8). This is the same perspective of multicultural education, since multicultural education seeks to lead ultimately to the “reconstruction and transformation of society” (p. 7). In short, according to Gay, the aims of multicultural education advocate human rights for all people, especially for the oppressed and marginalized in society, and seek transformation of society to promote democratic values such as social justice, which are clearly related to the main principles of

democratic education. Thus, she argued that “multicultural education is both a symbol and an evocation of the right of social contract of democracy” (p. 6).

Several scholars in the democratic education tradition also hold Gay’s perspective in advocating social justice. For instance, Gutmann (1987) argued that the “principles of nonrepression and nondiscrimination” (p. 14) are two important dimensions in democratic education and are clearly connected to promoting social justice. Also, Wade (2001) suggested a close connection between democratic education and teaching for social justice. Wade’s main point was that democratic education teaches students the skills and knowledge they need to play a vital role in their community and world, but it must also ensure that the students’ roles include practicing social action that promotes social justice.

In discussing the topic of education for democracy, Westheimer and Kahne (2004) provided three conceptions of a good citizen—a “personally responsible, participatory, and justice oriented citizen,” all of them are necessary elements of being a good citizen. According to them, the just-oriented citizens are those who seek to affect social change by “critically analyzing and addressing social issues and injustices” (p. 242). They suggested that education for democracy needs to help the students not only to be personally responsible and participatory citizens, but also to be just-oriented citizens by helping them “question, debate, and change established systems and structures that reproduce patterns of injustice over time” (p. 240).

Like the scholars above who advocate social justice in democratic education, several scholars in multicultural education, especially those who call themselves critical multiculturalists (Kanpol & McLaren, 1995; Obidah, 2000), explicitly address the issue of

social justice in their approaches. These scholars' main concerns are "how to build democracy in historically racist and hierarchical multicultural societies" (Sleeter & Bernal, 2004, p. 240) by addressing the issues of racism and oppression in society. For example, connecting the issue of racism and multiculturalism, Berlak and Moyenda (2001) stated that central to critical multiculturalism is "naming and actively challenging racism and other forms of injustice, not simply recognizing and celebrating differences and reducing prejudice" (p. 92). In fact, they discredited the merely humanistic concepts of multiculturalism that believe injustice will disappear if people simply learn to get along.

Some other critical multiculturalists link with critical pedagogy (Kanpol & McLaren, 1995; Obidah, 2000) in addressing the issue of social justice. For instance, Kanpol and McLaren (1995) used the term critical multiculturalism to emphasize their argument that "justice is not evenly distributed and cannot be so without a radical and profound change in social structures and in terms of development of historical agency and a praxis of possibility" (p. 13). Also, Obidah (2000) described herself as a critical multiculturalist because the tools of both critical pedagogy and multicultural education helped her to link a dynamic conception of culture and identity with an analysis of the inequality of power structures in society.

As both scholars of democratic education such as Gutmann (1987) and Wade (2001), and critical multiculturalists such as Berlak and Moyenda (2001) and Kanpol and McLaren (1995) clearly advocate, seeking social justice is a common idea in both democratic education and multicultural education. In the following section, I will describe my approach and position for democratic teacher education with a focus on social justice.

My position for democratic teacher education with a focus on social justice. I

acknowledge that democratic teacher education needs to employ many different methods and processes, many of which are currently practiced by democratic teacher educators. These methods and processes include: service learning projects, the practice of collaboration and cooperation within school/university partnerships, commitment to dialogue, and the practice of critical thinking in order to accomplish its goals. However, my main approach to and position on democratic teacher education is that its core must focus on social justice *if* its goal—contributing to a more just and democratic society—is really to be accomplished in a contemporary multicultural society. My position is in fact the same as Gay’s (1997) approach, which emphasizes social justice and human rights for all people, especially for those oppressed and marginalized in society, both in democratic education and multicultural education. In a contemporary multicultural society, diversity must be affirmed, but it must be “affirmed within a commitment to social justice” (Estrada & McLaren, 1993, p. 31).

Some detailed discussions of two scholars’ approaches to social justice in teacher education are provided below as the supporting rationale of my position. The discussion below draws on the work of Marilyn Cochran-Smith, whose main area is teacher education, and Sonia Nieto, whose work focuses on multicultural and bilingual education.

As a teacher educator committed to social justice, Cochran-Smith (2004) characterizes her approach to teacher education as “teacher education for social justice.” She argues that “the most important goals of teaching and teacher education are social responsibility, social change, and social justice” (p. 64). Her assertion regarding the goals

of teacher education rests on her philosophy about teachers' potential role in society.

Regarding this, Cochran-Smith contends:

Teachers cannot fix the problems of society by “teaching better,” nor can teachers alone, whether through individual or group efforts, alter the life chances of children they teach, particularly if the larger issues of structural and institutional racism and inequity are not addressed. However, while teacher cannot *substitute for* social movements aimed at the transformation of society's fundamental inequities, their work has the potential to *contribute to* those movements in essential ways by being part of collective projects and larger communities for social justice. (p. 19, *Italics in original*)

In particular, Cochran-Smith (2004) suggests that the problem of teacher preparation needs to be understood as “both a learning problem (rather than a training-and-testing problem) and a political problem related to issue of equity and social justice (rather than simply a policy implementation problem)” (p. xix). The idea that teacher education is a learning problem is founded on three key ideas: (a) knowing the important role of inquiry communities, that is, teacher education occurs in the context of inquiry communities wherein all participants—beginning and experienced teachers, and school- and university-based educators—are both learners and researchers; (b) understanding inquiry as an intellectual and political stance rather than as a project or time-bound activity; and (c) realizing that teacher research, as part of an inquiry stance, is a way to generate local knowledge of practice that is contextualized, cultural, and critical.

Cochran-Smith's (2004) idea that teacher education is a political problem is directly related to issues of democracy, equity, and social justice, and is also based on three key ideas. The first key idea is that teaching is a political activity. She argues that teaching and teacher education are political and collective enterprises, rather than neutral and

individual efforts. Her point here is not to suggest the politicization of teaching, but to stress Freire's (1970) contention that all teaching is political and embedded in particular sets of values. Accepting this idea, Cochran-Smith maintains that teaching should be an activity committed to reducing inequalities found in our society. Thus, Cochran-Smith (2001) suggests that the major goal of preservice teacher education for social justice is "helping prospective teachers think deeply about and deliberately claim the role of educator as well as activist based on political consciousness and on ideological commitment to combating the inequities of American life" (p. 3).

The second key idea is that all teacher policies are driven by values and are, at least in part, ideological. This implies interrogating and revealing the "politics of policies" related to teacher preparation from the perspectives of social justice, race, diversity, and equity. The third key idea is that teaching and teacher preparation for social justice are vital elements of an educational system in and for a democratic society. Her point here is: if all free and equal citizens of society are to have the benefit of a democratic education, all teachers must have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to teach toward the democratic society. Especially in today's rapidly changing and increasingly diverse society, the necessity of teachers' knowledge of social and cultural contexts is a critical element in sustaining and promoting democratic ideas. By stating this, she clearly suggests that teachers and teacher educators be stewards of democracy.

Nieto (2004) also connects multicultural education and democratic ideas, particularly with respect to social justice. Nieto defines multicultural education as embedded in a sociopolitical context, and as antiracist and basic education for all students

that permeate all areas of schooling. She also contends that “since it uses critical pedagogy as its underlying philosophy and focuses on knowledge, reflection, and action (praxis) as the basis for social change, multicultural education promotes democratic principles of social justice” (p. 346).

In discussing different characteristics of multicultural education, Nieto (2004) classifies four levels of support for diversity. The first, most basic level is *tolerance*. To tolerate differences means to endure them, although not necessarily to embrace them. Nieto identifies the problem that many schools consider stressing “tolerance for diversity” as a comprehensive mission statement. *Acceptance* is the next level of support for diversity. At this level, people at the very least acknowledge differences without denying the importance of differences. Celebrating some differences through activities such as multicultural fairs and cookbooks is a practical example of this level. The third level of support for diversity is *respect*. Since respect means to admire and hold in high esteem, at this level, diversity is used as the basis for education. A practical example of this level is offering bilingual education programs that use the students’ native language not only as a bridge to English but also throughout their schooling.

Finally, the highest level of support for diversity is *Affirmation, solidarity, and critique*. At this level, the cultures and languages of students and their families are viewed as legitimate and valid vehicles for student learning. Moreover, at this level, “the curriculum and institutional techniques are based on an understanding of social justice as central to education” (p. 389). In fact, the reason why Nieto grouped *affirmation, solidarity, and critique* together in naming this highest level comes from her contention that

“affirming diversity is not enough unless we also challenge inequitable policies and practices that grant unfair advantages to some students over others” (p. 390). She suggests that although affirming their language and culture can help students become successful and well-adjusted learners, they are unlikely to have a lasting impact in promoting real change unless language and cultural issues are approached through critical lenses focused on equity and social justice.

Related to teacher education for equity and social justice, Nieto (2000) argues that schools and colleges of education need to radically transform their policies and practices “if they are to become places where teachers and prospective teachers learn to become effective with students of all backgrounds” (p. 180). Using a social justice perspective in teacher education, she proposes three ways in which equity and social justice can be placed front and center in teacher education programs.

The first way is that the teacher education program takes a stand on social justice and diversity. This implies two things: (a) considering diversity not as a problem, as an assimilation approach does, but as a resource in the service of learning, and (b) helping prospective teachers learn how to promote the learning of all students, and to develop educational environments that are fair and affirming. The second way is to make social justice ubiquitous in teacher education. She contends that since social justice and diversity are not the same things, “equalizing conditions for student learning needs to be at the core of a concern for diversity,” (p. 183) especially considering current unequal educational outcomes among students of different backgrounds. A concern for social justice means critically analyzing school policies and practices—the curriculum, textbooks and materials,

instructional strategies, and tracking—in order to identify why and how the schools are unjust for some students by devaluing their identities. The third way is to promote teaching as a life-long journey of transformation. Nieto particularly emphasizes that teaching as a life-long journey does not mean merely an individual journey, but is “equally a collective and institutional journey” (p. 184) that would happen both outside individual classrooms and college courses.

Drawing on the work of Cochran-Smith and Nieto, both of whom emphasize social justice in teacher education, my theoretical position on democratic teacher education also focuses on social justice. In a contemporary multicultural society, diversity needs to be affirmed as the inevitable condition of human society. However, affirming diversity itself is not enough; it needs to be affirmed within a commitment to social justice, *if* the society is to be truly democratic in valuing the human rights of all people. This is why my position on democratic teacher education focuses on social justice.

Research on Studying Prejudice Reduction and Equity Pedagogy

Some teacher educators have reviewed the literature that addresses the issue of diversity and teacher education (Hollins & Guzman, 2005; Ladson-Billings, 1995a; Sleeter, 2001). After reviewing 39 books and journal articles related to this issue between 1988 and 1992, Ladson-Billings (1995a) concluded that few teacher education programs were engaged in either a prejudice reduction approach or an equity pedagogy approach. Based on her findings, this section reviews research studies that have addressed the issue of diversity and teacher education, especially those that focused on prejudice reduction and equity

pedagogy. In particular, several factors set up the scope of this review. First, this review only includes research studies published in the journals since 1992, because Ladson-Billings' (1995a) chapter reviewed literature up to 1992. Second, although some researchers (Marri, 2005; Powell, 1997) have reported on inservice teacher education studies related to issues of diversity, this review only focuses on studies of preservice teacher education programs as related to issues of diversity. Finally, while various researchers have also studied the impact of teacher education programs focused on preparing teachers for diversity (Cabello & Eckmier, 1995; Wiggins & Follo, 1999) or the experiences of prospective teachers in a program explicitly focused on diversity (Ladson-Billings, 2001; McDonald, 2005), this review only includes studies focused on addressing the impact of coursework and field experiences on teacher education.

This second section is organized into four sub-sections with the purpose of showing how different contexts in teacher education affect teacher candidates' prejudice reduction or equity pedagogy. The four sub-sections will review the following topics: (a) studies on a course, (b) studies on a course with field experience connected to a school and/or community, (c) studies on school-based field experiences, and (d) studies on community-based field experiences. Furthermore, in reviewing the (c) studies on school-based field experiences and (d) studies on community-based field experiences, the rationale of locating those studies within each topic is based upon the "reported results" of the studies, because it appears that, in most cases, the researchers of those studies did not clearly explain which approach—prejudice reduction or equity pedagogy—their studies focused on.

Review of studies on prejudice reduction. According to Banks (2001), prejudice reduction in the K-12 curriculum “describes lessons and activities teachers use to help students develop positive attitudes toward different racial, ethnic, and cultural groups” (p. 21). Indeed, the necessity of prejudice reduction approaches in teacher preparation programs rests on the assumption that the majority of teacher candidates, who are White, middle-class, female teacher candidates, have limited experiences with those from backgrounds different from their own, and many of them appear to enter teacher preparation programs with negative or deficit attitudes and beliefs about those different from themselves (Hollins & Guzman, 2005). The critical problem of this situation is that when teachers believe that diversity is a deficit to be overcome or when they hold negative and low expectations of their diverse students, they have difficulty in employing both culturally responsive and academic challenging teaching (Ladson-Billings, 1995b). As such, before entering the actual teaching profession, these teacher candidates need to have opportunities to rethink and change their prejudiced, stereotyped beliefs and attitudes towards those different from themselves during their teacher preparation.

Following Banks’ (2001) definition of prejudice reduction, this section reviews the research focused on helping teacher candidates either reduce prejudice about certain groups or develop more democratic attitudes and values toward cultural diversity as related to prejudice reduction.

Studies on a course. A majority of the studies on courses that aimed to reduce prejudice reported generally positive results in terms of teacher candidates’ attitudes and beliefs with respect to various prejudice reduction strategies and assignments in each course,

while several studies reported mixed or little results on the change of candidates' attitudes and beliefs.

Studies reporting generally positive results. Those studies of courses which reported generally positive results on candidates' attitudes and beliefs in prejudice reduction can be grouped two different ways—(a) use of a particular instruction or assignment in a course, and (b) use of multiple strategies in a course—in trying to help teacher candidates reduce prejudice or increase awareness of diversity.

(a) Studies on the use of particular instruction or assignments in a course: Several studies (Florio-Ruane, 1994; Marshall, 1998; McFalls & Cobb-Roberts, 2001) examined how particular instruction or exercises in a course, such as “writing autobiography,” (Florio-Ruane, 1994) can affect teacher candidates' learning about diversity. For example, Marshall (1998) investigated how the use of the “issues exchange” activity in her multicultural education course affected the teacher candidates' understanding of diversity. Her “issues exchange” activity was a series of point/counterpoint dialogues on many topics related to cultural diversity. For example, after providing a provocative question such as “Do some subordinate culture groups use injustices of the past as excuses for their lack of success today?”(p. 60), she assigned pairs of students to discuss opposing positions on diversity. One student would take the anti-multicultural education position while their partner took a pro-multicultural education position. To investigate the impact of the activity, Marshall surveyed 15 students from a course taken one or two years before, and got usable feedback from 10 of the 11 respondents. The analysis of the survey indicated that nearly all students reported being more open to addressing the issue of race after the activity, and

most students reported that the activity had been helpful in trying to better understand the perspectives of minorities. Also, all but two students acknowledged realizing their own personal biases, such as prejudiced feelings or narrow-mindedness through the activity. The significance of this study is that the researcher surveyed the students 1 or 2 years *later* after the course, rather than immediately upon completion of the course; thus it was possible to learn how the students considered the activity in terms of their learning of diversity even 1 or 2 years later after the activity.

McFalls and Cobb-Roberts (2001) conducted experimental research investigating the application of “the principles of cognitive dissonance theory” as an instructional strategy for reducing resistance to diversity. The research participants were 124 undergraduate potential preservice education majors enrolled in two sections of a course on diversity education. The majority of the participants were White, and the demographics of both sections were very similar. However, the research design for each section was quite different. Students in section 1 read about an article that addressed the issue of White privilege, and, following a discussion session, were asked to write a response about what they had been learned. In contrast, although the students in section 2 read the same article, they received a lecture on cognitive dissonance theory that included an explanation of the theory and a discussion of the origins of stereotypes. They were then asked to write about the connection between the content of the article on White privilege and the content of the lecture on cognitive theory. The analysis of the written responses from both sections revealed that a greater percentage of students in section 2 demonstrated an awareness of hidden privilege than those in section 1. Based on those results, the authors contended that

“incorporating cognitive dissonance theory into instruction on diversity creates an awareness of dissonance (i.e. metadissonance), and has the potential for reducing resistance to diversity issues” (p. 164). Clearly, the two studies by Marshall (1998) and McFalls and Cobb-Roberts (2001) show how focused instruction and well-crafted activities in a multicultural education course can be effectively used for helping to increase the teacher candidates’ awareness of issues of diversity.

Moreover, several studies reported the results of particular assignments in their courses that were used to explore addressing racial issues or for helping the teacher candidates to understand other cultures (Garmon, 1998; Hyland & Noffke, 2005; Wiest, 1998). For instance, Garmon (1998) examined how “dialogue journals” between the instructor and each student as a course requirement can be used to promote student learning about racial issues in his one-semester multicultural education course. Analysis of the e-mail journals submitted by 21 students showed that students became more aware of racial issues in education from the dialogue journal through their own self-reflection, through information provided by the instructor’s comments, and through having their ideas challenged by the instructor. Considering the likelihood that each student was at a different level of racial awareness when they enrolled in the multicultural education course, exchanging dialogue journals between the instructor and each student is clearly a useful tool in promoting student learning, since the instructor can provide “individualized instruction” (p. 42), as Garmon suggested.

In another study, Hyland and Noffke (2005) reported the results of the community and social inquiry assignments in their elementary social studies methods course at two

different universities. The main goal of these assignments was to promote student learning in terms of understanding group marginality and diversity. In particular, the focus of the community inquiry assignment was on helping the students understand their placement school's relationship with the local community by critically examining the neighborhood around the school, including community perceptions of the school and school perceptions of the community. Also, based on the idea that students must cross cultural boundaries in order to learn about historically marginalized groups, the social inquiry assignment required students to cross cultural boundaries and learn from people different from themselves by attending a religious or cultural event in which they would be the minority, or by conducting an oral history inquiry with someone culturally different from themselves. One of the major findings from the analysis of both the in-class discussions and each student's written reflection on these assignments was that their "eyes had been opened," (p. 375) and that the activity had been valuable in helping them to reduce their previous prejudices about people from historically marginalized groups. Since the main focus of their course was on preparing the students "to engage in teaching for social justice," (p. 379) Hyland and Noffke emphasized the limits of simple prejudice reduction and maintained that the ultimate goal lies in working for justice and social change. However, they also suggested that students' prejudice reduction and sympathy for people from historically marginalized groups is "a necessary (yet insufficient) step in developing a commitment to justice and social change" (p. 376).

Similar to the social inquiry assignment in Hyland and Noffke's study, Wiest (1998) assigned her students a "cultural immersion project" in which students immerse

themselves for at least one hour in a setting in which they are a minority. One of the important findings from this assignment was that several students expressed that “newly acquired cultural knowledge helped dispel stereotypes, misconceptions, and fears they had about the group they visited” (p. 360). These two studies provide insight to teacher educators regarding how to design particular course assignments that connect to social and community experiences in order to help students reduce prejudice about certain groups.

(b) Studies on the use of multiple strategies in a course: Several studies also reported positive outcomes of employing a multiple strategies approach in a single course for prejudice reduction or anti-racist development (Lawrence, 1997; Lawrence & Bunche, 1996; Obidah, 2000; Peterson, Cross, Johnson, & Howell, 2000). Peterson et al. (2000) investigated the impact of a Foundations of Education class that used multiple instructional strategies that were designed to address the issues of intolerance and to promote teacher candidates’ understanding of multicultural education. In particular, they focused on analyzing to what extent the students’ attitudes regarding diversity were changed by classroom instructional strategies, and what types of instructional strategies were the most influential in inducing those changes. The analysis of the researcher-developed posttest questionnaire which was administered to 26 students (25 Caucasian and one Hispanic) upon completion of the course revealed that (a) most students (80.7%) responded that their views about intolerance and multicultural issues were changed “greatly” by the class, and (b) it was reported that viewing and discussing a film titled *The Color of Fear* (Wah, 1994, cited in p. 34) had the greatest impact in terms of inducing change in student attitudes toward diversity. Students ranked the impact of the film above other classroom activities, including

working together on group presentations, listening to the instructor's and classmates' stories, and a lesson planning assignment with a focus on diversity.

Similar to the course activities and assignments studied by Peterson et al. (2000), Obidah (2000) also employed a wide range of instructional tools and practices such as critical reading of texts, whole class and small group dialogues, viewing and analyzing films and documentaries, e-mail exchanges, and in-class debates and presentations in her multicultural education course, and investigated the effects of her course on the students' perceptions and beliefs about culture. Although not all students in this research project were education majors (74% of the students indicated that they intended to become teachers), the analysis of the students' written responses demonstrated that "their perceptions and beliefs about culture were changed during the course" (p. 1053), in particular, their perspective on multiculturalism broadened, and their understanding of bias and cultural assumptions in teaching and learning increased. However, this study as well as the study by Peterson et al. (2000) could not evaluate the lasting long-term impact of the course, because the students' written responses, which comprised most of the data in both studies, were collected upon completion of the course.

In another similar study, Lawrence and Bunche (1996) investigated to what extent a one-semester multicultural education course that utilized multiple instructional methods including readings, discussions, films, collaborative projects, and writing assignments "could help white teacher education students develop a white antiracist identity" (p. 531). Analyzing the data collected from five White female teacher candidates in that course, which included interviews at the beginning and end of the course, weekly written response

papers, and a formal paper submitted at the end of the course, Lawrence and Bunche contended that “a race-focused multicultural education course can help White students become more reflective about the effects of racism, and it can influence the development of their racial identities to some degree” (p. 541). They also maintained, however, that more than one course is needed to guide and support White students’ further development of a positive White anti-racist identity.

As a follow-up study, in order to find out whether the changes White students experienced during the course transferred into their teaching practice during student teaching, Lawrence (1997) interviewed three of the five students from the prior study after they finished a 15-week practicum experience. From the analysis of the interview data, she contended that the development accrued during the one semester university course “can translate into some successful attempts at multicultural teaching during a practicum” (p. 115). Nevertheless, she also suggested that one course in race-focused content is not enough to ensure multicultural teaching success, and effective preparation for multicultural teaching must extend beyond formal coursework into students’ practicum sites. Considering the fact that few studies have examined the impact of multicultural education coursework on how student teachers actually teach children in their student teaching classroom (Sleeter, 2001), the importance of this study comes from the fact that it focused on examining how much the learning in a course carried over to student teaching practice. However, this study also has some limitations due to the small number of student teachers interviewed and because the data sources were only self-reported data from participation, without the researcher observing their actual student teaching practice.

Studies reporting mixed or little results. Several studies reported mixed or little results regarding changes of candidates' attitudes and beliefs in prejudice reduction (Cockrell, Placier, Cockrell, & Middleton, 1999; Greenman, & Kimmel, 1995; Katz, 2000). For example, Cockrell et al. (1999) found little impact on students' views of diversity in their multicultural foundation course, based on the results collected in course evaluations. In order to explore the reasons for these limited results, they initiated an action research study the following semester that investigated students' identities, experiences, and beliefs about multicultural education. There were two sets of data sources in this study: (a) multiple data including a demographic questionnaire, initial position paper, reflective journal, and a capstone paper from 24 randomly selected sample students among the 128 students who were enrolled in the four sections of that course, and (b) five focus group discussions involving 26 student volunteers among the 128 students. Analysis of both the initial papers and the final capstone papers indicated that the course had little impact in changing the students' beliefs about multicultural education. In fact, only 3 students among the 24 had changed their positions regarding multicultural education by the end of the semester: among the 10 students who initially positioned school as a cultural transmitter, only 2 changed their view to school to cultural mediator, and among the 13 students who initially positioned school as cultural mediator, only 1 student changed his/her view to school as cultural transformer. In addition, while most students addressed some of the goals of multicultural education in their papers, analysis of the five focus group discussions revealed that few were confident that those goals would be achieved in practice. As a result of this study, Cockrell et al. contend that the students had different views of diversity

“based on personal experiences, political ideologies, and beliefs about the roles of schools and teachers” (p. 362) and that those perceptions are not easily transformed. This study again informs teacher educators knowing the students’ backgrounds and previous experiences before they enter a multicultural education course is a critical element in helping them develop democratic attitudes and values toward multiculturalism.

In a similar vein, Katz (2000) reported mixed results regarding the impact of her bilingual education course on the attitudes and beliefs of 200 teacher candidates, 70% of whom were White. Analyzing data such as weekly written reflections based on readings and class discussions, written field observations, and self-initiated final projects, she found that the course contributed to growth in student knowledge, but produced little change in attitudes and no reduction in prejudice. She also found that, during the course, students who entered the course already possessing positive attitudes towards bilingual education became stronger advocates for it, while those students who were initially skeptical of or resistant towards bilingual education tended to “refute the research and look for evidence to support their beliefs in English-Only education” (p. 7). As implied in the study by Cockrell et al. (1999), these finding also emphasize the importance of knowing the students’ initial perceptions and beliefs about multicultural education in helping them to develop democratic attitudes toward cultural diversity.

Studies on a course with field experience connected to a school and/or community. A number of studies have examined the impact of a course with field experiences connected to a school or a community in helping teacher candidates reduce

prejudice or increase cultural awareness. Many of these studies reported generally positive results, although several studies reported mixed or little results.

Studies reporting generally positive results. Several studies reported the positive impact of a course with field experience within a school setting on changes in teacher candidates' attitudes and beliefs towards children of color or towards cultural diversity (Arias & Poynor, 2001; Fry & McKinney, 1997; Olmedo, 1997). For example, Olmedo (1997) reported the positive results of her fieldwork course that consisted of a two hour weekly class session for 15 weeks, and a fieldwork component in which the students spent one full day per week for eight to ten weeks observing and helping a teacher in an urban elementary classroom. The course also consisted of readings, class discussions, and assignments related to teaching in an urban multicultural environment. Analysis of students' journal entries and essays from 16 White undergraduates, in which they reflected on their field experiences in relation to course readings and class discussions, indicated positive changes in the students' beliefs and attitudes over the course. Initially, the students writing reflected beliefs that "inner city students of color are not motivated to learn," and regarded "diversity as a problem," as well as positing that "teachers should be colorblind if they are to be fair" (p. 250). As a result of the field experience combined with the readings and class discussions, the undergraduate students' attitudes eventually changed with respect to the schools in which they were placed as well as the teachers and students with whom they worked. For example, they came to realize that "children want to learn," "good teaching can take place even in inner city schools" and "being colorblind was not good pedagogy" (p. 251). Olmedo attributed the success of this intervention to the use of small groups rather

than whole-class discussions, course readings which focused on accounts of teachers' experiences in urban schools, and the course assignments that required the students to focus on particular objectives during their fieldwork. She concluded that:

As a result of their interaction with students of color and diverse language backgrounds in the classroom, these prospective teachers became aware of the fact that issues related to multicultural education were not just "politically correct" doctrines to be discussed in the university, but were real concerns to be addressed by teachers in the schools, ... their experiences in the fieldwork presented challenges to the deficit views of inner city schools which they had previously accepted as social reality. (p. 256)

Indeed, the important finding of this study is that the attitudes towards children of color in urban school settings held by predominately White, middle-class undergraduates could be improved if they are provided appropriate opportunities, such as those presented in this study.

Fry and McKinney (1997) also reported positive results for their language arts methods course that included a 4-week field experience in a predominately African-American urban school. In particular, they focused on examining preservice teaching experiences at an urban, culturally different school. Analysis of the data, including dialogue journals, beginning- and end-of-semester interviews, class discussions and assignments, biographies, and surveys showed that all 10 of the White female students, who had little previous experience with cultural diversity, increased their cultural awareness and sensitivity, and that they felt a sense of preparedness to teach culturally different students.

Similarly, Arias and Poynor (2001) reported changes in the attitudes and beliefs of three ESL and two bilingual pre-service teachers, who as a cohort attended a reading and language arts methods course at an urban professional development school (PDS). The

major finding of this study, which analyzed data including course observations, placement observations, and semi-structured interviews, showed that the preservice teachers' dispositions changed to "accept and respect the cultural and linguistic diversity of others" (p. 418). These two studies demonstrate how subject methods courses connected to field experiences in culturally diverse schools can be effective in helping to prepare teacher candidates to teach diverse students.

A study conducted by Boyle-Baise (1998) also reported positive results in analyzing the experiences of 65 preservice elementary and secondary teachers involved in community service learning (CSL) as part of a multicultural education course. The multicultural education course was focused on race, ethnicity, and culture, but also incorporated whole course projects that supported the idea of CSL by including the study of ethnic histories and the analysis of memoirs written by and about ethnic minority individuals. Preservice teachers were organized into site-based inquiry teams and placed in CSL sites which served culturally diverse and low-income populations such as community centers and churches. Each team spent 20 hours in the field over 8 weeks, observing, assisting, and completing an inquiry project. Data sources for this study were 25 group interviews, 65 individual reflection papers, and 13 inquiry projects. The analysis of the data indicated that the participants experienced "consciousness-raising," in which they referred to CSL as a process of "getting exposed," "becoming more aware," and "accepting cultural diversity" (p. 54). This study is a good example of how the integration of a community field experience within a multicultural course can be beneficial in helping teacher candidates to develop deeper cultural awareness.

Studies reporting mixed or little results. Several studies reported mixed results or minimal results in terms of the impact of a course with field experience on changes in candidates' attitudes and beliefs (Burant & Kerby, 2002; Causey, Thomas, & Armento, 2000; Murtadha-Watts, 1998). Burant and Kerby (2002) examined experiences of preservice teachers in an urban school coupled with community-based early field experiences integrated into their educational foundations course and a general methods course. In addition to classroom-based field experience, the 26 participants of this study, 9 of whom were people of color, were required to participate in 10 hours of a variety of school wide and/or community-based field experiences, such as riding the school bus, providing child care for the Parent-Teacher Organization meetings, assembling and delivering food baskets to families, and conducting community interviews. Data sources for this study included weekly reflective papers and action reports, field notes, and interviews. The findings of the analysis of the data showed somewhat mixed results. Twelve students among 26 had either "deepening multicultural experiences" that saw "the potential of the neighborhood as a place for learning, as a rich resource for curriculum," or "eye-opening and transformational experiences" that led them to "desire to teach in diverse urban schools" (p. 567). In contrast, 14 students had "masked multicultural experiences" a "partially miseducative experience," or an "escaping experience," and they retained their preference for teaching White, middle-class children.

The study done by Murtadha-Watts (1998) also showed mixed results. He required 22 education major students in his educational psychology class to tutor students 1 hour and 45 minutes a week for 10 weeks at a full-service public school, marked by collaborative

relationships between community agencies and the school. The students maintained reflective journals after each tutoring session, wrote reflective papers at the beginning and end of the program, and were interviewed regarding their experiences and expectations. In the educational psychology course, the students discussed different learning theories, and how students' backgrounds affected their learning. This study revealed that, although most students confessed "their expectations about the children proved to be wrong after their experiences, several stated their stereotyped expectations were confirmed" (p. 627). To these several students, the experience of working did little to challenge them to rethink their assumptions.

In yet another study, Causey, Thomas, and Armento (2000) investigated the impact of an undergraduate middle-school social studies methods class that included three weeks of internship in an urban school. In this methods class, students met in class for six weeks, interned in urban schools for three weeks, then returned to class for one week. The main purpose of including three weeks of internship was to provide an "immersion experience in an urban school" (p. 35). After analyzing the data, which consisted of autobiographical narratives, reflection journals, post-experiences essays, and action plans developed by the students, the authors maintain that most of the 24 students retained their original beliefs about diversity, while only 2 White females seemed to have restructured their diversity beliefs after the experiences. However, a follow-up study three years later, focused on testing the persistence of these two females' restructured beliefs using interviews and observing their actual classrooms bore out contrasting results. One of the teachers who appeared to have restructured her diversity beliefs by the end of the teacher education

program reverted to a less culturally sensitive stance during her three years of teaching in an urban setting, and remembered little of the diversity emphasis in her teacher education program. In contrast, the other teacher who appeared to have restructured her diversity beliefs as a result of teacher education program continued to act upon her new beliefs over the 3 years of teaching, and clearly attributed her current beliefs and actions to the teacher education experience, especially to her experience in urban schools.

Each of the three studies mentioned above clearly indicate how difficult it is to help teacher candidates change their stereotyped, prejudiced beliefs and attitudes towards students in urban schools, even when teacher education programs provide them useful opportunities with good intentions.

Studies on school-based field experience. Although many studies have examined the influences of both internships and student teaching experiences on teacher candidates, most of them (Goodwin, 1997; Rushton, 2001) have been focused on descriptions of the teacher candidates' experiences and feelings, and were not directly related to the matter of prejudice reduction. As such, only a few studies are located in this category.

Several researchers have conducted studies comparing the impact of urban and suburban field experiences in terms of helping teacher candidates develop positive attitudes toward urban schools (Cook & Van Cleaf, 2000; Mason, 1997). For example, Mason (1997) reported the results of a two-year study that investigated the impact of urban school field experiences on the attitudes of preservice teachers. His research questions were: (a) As a result of an urban school field experience, do preservice teachers' attitudes toward inner-city, low-income, and minority students improve? And (b) how do attitudes toward low-

income, minority students of preservice teachers who complete an urban school field experience compare with those who complete in a suburban school? The survey results were obtained over four semesters from 176 junior and senior level undergraduates enrolled in an elementary certification program and, as a program requirement, all these students completed an eight-week field-based practicum, spending two full days a week in a classroom observing and assisting the classroom teacher. Seventy-five students completed their practicum in urban schools where a large proportion of the students were African-American and Latino/a and from low-income families, while 101 students were placed in suburban, middle-class schools. The major finding of this study was that the experiences in the urban school classrooms had an overall positive impact on attitudes toward urban schools. In particular, it showed that experiences in urban school classrooms did not diminish prospective teachers' attitudes toward urban schools, and improved perceptions in certain areas such as student motivation and language proficiency, discipline, and parental support.

Similar to Mason's (1997) study, Cook and Van Cleaf (2000) conducted a study that compared the impact of student teaching in four different settings (urban Comer, urban non-Comer, suburban, and rural schools). The data generated in this study came from survey questionnaires collected from 51 first-year teachers selected on the basis of having completed student teaching in urban schools utilizing the Comer reform model (n=11), urban schools not using the Comer model (n=12), suburban schools (n=19), and rural schools (n=9). The major finding of this study was that first year teachers who had student teaching experiences in urban settings, regardless of Comer model, "perceived themselves

as better prepared to deal with multicultural needs of children and better prepared to work with parents in multiracial and multiethnic settings” (p. 165).

In contrast to the findings of Mason’s (1997) study and Cook and Van Cleaf’s (2000) study, Tiezzi and Cross (1997) reported little impact of early field experience in urban classrooms on helping teacher candidates develop a positive attitude toward urban schools. They investigated the attitudes and beliefs toward teaching in urban schools of 48 students who were enrolled in a 50-hour early field observation experience in urban classrooms. While in the field, the candidates completed several assignments including observation logs and journaling focused primarily on the school and the classroom organization and learning environment. Based on content analysis of several written assignments, such as reflective journals and personal history essays, Tiezzi and Cross concluded that the teacher candidates had firmly held beliefs about teaching in urban schools that were based on their educational and life experiences. They found that the most commonly held beliefs were that inner-city children could not learn and were poor, hostile, and unmotivated, and that their parents did not care. They concluded that these beliefs often persisted throughout the course of the field experience, and also cautioned about the possible negative impact of field experiences in urban schools where little support or preparation is provided to students.

Similar to Tiezzi and Cross, Deering and Stanutz’s (1995) research exploring “what effects a pre-student teaching field experience in a multicultural setting have on [teacher candidates’] cultural sensitivity” (p. 391) found that such experiences did not always have a positive impact. In this study, they administered a “Cultural Diversity Awareness

Inventory” as a pretest and posttest to investigate the impact of field experience in a multicultural setting on the cultural sensitivity of 16 secondary teacher candidates, who had not yet had multicultural education courses. The survey was designed to assess an individual’s attitudes, beliefs, and behavior, toward children of culturally diverse backgrounds. The 16 teacher candidates took the survey prior to and after a 10-week field experience in a middle school with a predominantly Hispanic and Black student population. The analysis of both surveys indicated that there was some evidence of growth in the student teachers after the 10-week field experience. For example, at the end of the experience, more student teachers said that “they would like to teach students different from themselves,” and fewer indicated that they were uncomfortable with people who spoke nonstandard English. However, the researcher suggested that one field experience without coursework in multicultural education “did not significantly improve the cultural sensitivity” (p. 393) of these preservice teachers.

Studies on community-based field experiences. Several studies investigated community-based field experiences, including tutoring low-income students, working in community agencies in locations with diverse populations, or internships in a Christian school. Although these community-based field experiences provided different types of contact with diverse populations, their common objective was to increase teacher candidates’ awareness, understanding, and acceptance of those different from themselves.

For instance, Potthoff, Dinsmore, Stirtz, Walsh, and Ziebarth (2000) explored the perceptions of preservice teachers regarding how the community-based field experiences in human services agencies impacted their growth in terms of knowledge, skills, and attitudes

about diversity. In this study, Potthoff et al. used a researcher-developed survey that had a 53-item Likert scale in order to investigate the experiences of 136 undergraduate teacher candidates, the majority of whom were White, enrolled in “A Community-Based Human Services Field Experiences course.” In this course, preservice teachers were placed in local human services programs and agencies such as preschool settings, educational support programs, and programs for families with special needs. The analysis of survey data indicated that experiences in human service agencies helped teacher candidates “acquire positive attitudes toward diversity, promoted empathy for persons different from themselves, and promoted communication skills for interacting with those from diverse populations” (p. 85). Furthermore, this study also suggests that one consideration that is critical for the success of this kind of service learning experience is the matter of selecting sites that can be directly related to the goals of a teacher education program, such as developing cultural awareness.

Seidl and Friend (2002) investigated the influence of cross-cultural, equal-status internships on the perspectives and identities of a group of predominantly White teacher candidates in a fifth-year, graduate-level teacher education program. More specifically, they tried to examine what kinds of benefits the teacher candidates could accrue when provided with opportunities to experience cross-cultural, equal status internships with a culturally and racially different school and community. In this study, both researchers were the primary mediators of a partnership between the university and a private Christian school serving mostly African-American students. The participants in the internship met and worked with African-American adults who were their peers, economically and

professionally. Data sources for this study included field notes of community and university meetings, classroom dialogue, and candidates' course assignments. Based on the data analysis, Seidl and Friend found that although there was some resistance by several White teacher candidates, such as "patronizing cultural authority" (p. 428), many of the students developed more a sophisticated understanding of culture, race, and education, and acquired an understanding of "de-centering cultural authority" (p. 427). The participants began to be aware of being in an unfamiliar cultural context where they are outsiders with little awareness of the cultural norms. From these findings, Seidl and Friend suggested that "cross-cultural encounters" (p. 431) that are mutually beneficial and equal in status are necessary in the construction of a multicultural and socially just society.

In a more intensive cross-cultural encounter, Aguilar and Pohan (1998) investigated the "cultural immersion experiences" (p. 29) of 9 students from Nebraska, who lived for 4.5 weeks in a Mexican household in the Southwest and worked on a 3-week arts program for children. Their findings were that the students showed considerable learning and growth in their awareness of cultural strengths and in their interest in teaching in culturally diverse settings. Moreover, they began to question their previously held stereotyped beliefs. In particular, what each student learned depended on his or her own unique experiences. For example, some described learning through participation in ceremonies, others through the children's arts program, and still others through families.

Finally, Bollin's (1996) study was focused on the experiences of 40 elementary teacher candidates who tutored low-income children from an ethnic group different from themselves. Content analysis of reflective journals in this study revealed that the teacher

candidates' understanding of their own ethnic identity increased, as did their understanding of ethnicity and social class as factors in students' school experiences. As is true for each of the other studies reviewed in this section, Bollin's research generally demonstrates a positive impact on teacher candidates' development of cultural awareness as a result of participating in the tutoring program.

Review of studies on equity pedagogy. Banks (2001) suggested that "equity pedagogy" exists when teachers modify their teaching in ways that will facilitate the academic achievement of students from diverse racial, cultural, gender, and social-class groups" (p. 21). This includes creating curriculum and instruction based on students' backgrounds, fostering self-determinations, and attending to oppressed and underserved groups. In particular, the ultimate goal of equity pedagogy is helping students from diverse racial, ethnic, and cultural group attain the knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed to function effectively within, and help create and perpetuate, a just and democratic society (C. M. Banks & J. Banks, 1995). As such, employing "culturally relevant pedagogy" (Ladson-Billings, 2001) is one example of equity pedagogy. Following Banks' (2001) definition, this section reviews the research studies that try to help teacher candidates understand and employ equity pedagogy.

Studies on a course. In this category, the studies of courses that intended to prepare teacher candidates to provide equity pedagogy in their K-12 classrooms showed that two studies produced a positive impact, while two studies confronted some resistance from the candidates.

Clark and Medina (2000) helped teacher candidates develop equity pedagogy approaches by focusing on the integration of multicultural education with narrative theory in their introductory literacy and culture course. In this course, Clark and Medina had candidates work in self-selected reading groups where they chose among book-length narratives. They studied the progress of three teacher candidates (one White, one Black, and one Latina White) who chose the same book. Using e-mail conversations, group discussions, individual reading logs, interviews, observations, and selected course work as data sources, Clark and Medina found that the teacher candidates did grow from the experience. The main findings of this study showed that the three students experienced the shift in terms of three categories during the course: (a) shifts in their understanding of literacy, (b) shifts in their understanding of multiculturalism, and (c) shifts in their understanding of teaching. In particular, the three students began to understand that multiple perspectives and cultural contexts influence how individuals construct literacy. This enabled them to correct their own overgeneralized conclusions about those from cultural and experiential backgrounds different from their own, and better understand cultural conditions. Based on the findings of this study, the authors suggested that, while reading and writing literacy narratives is not a panacea for the problems of diversity and literacy in teacher education, these activities can be “powerful tools fostering multicultural understanding and a more complex conception of literacy among preservice teachers” (p. 72).

Similarly, Morales (2000) reported a positive impact in terms of helping teacher candidates develop understanding and applications of equity pedagogy as a result of her

approach to teaching an early childhood education course on diversity by employing a constructivist philosophy paired with a Developmentally and Culturally Appropriate Practices framework. For example, in one session, students collected materials related to a culture different from their own, and wrote a paper about that culture. Drawing on pre- and post-course surveys, journals, and reflections, her overall conclusion from this study was that the students gained self-confidence in working with children and families different from themselves, and acquired an understanding of cultural and experiential differences as related to the construction of “developmentally and culturally appropriate strategies for young children” (p. 71).

In contrast, Rodriguez (1998) identified some resistance by the teacher candidates in his science methods course. He used a “socio-transformative constructivist orientation” to link multicultural education (teaching diversity) and social constructivist theoretical framework (teaching for understanding) in trying to help his class of 18 teacher candidates learn to teach science for diversity. However, throughout the course, he confronted two types of resistance among the students: “resistance to ideological change (resistance to changing one’s beliefs and value system) and resistance to pedagogical change (resistance to changing one’s perception of what constitutes being an effective teacher)” (p. 616). Rodriguez chose four White teacher candidates who were seemingly more open and had contrasting views of science for further examination through interviews, class assignments, field notes, and videotaped lessons. He concluded that “a counter-resistance strategy” incorporating dialogue, a focus on metacognition and reflexivity, and the use of authentic

science activities helped these four students overcome resistance and begin to see science teaching and learning as a socially constructed process.

Southerland and Gess-Newsome's (1999) study confronted some obstacles from teacher candidates in helping them employ equity pedagogy approaches. Based on a "social-objective constructivist" view that focused on how individuals make sense of science, the science methods course used a variety of teaching methods to help teacher candidates employ inclusive science teaching that embraced student diversity. However, using transcriptions of class discussions, journal entries, interviews, planning units of instruction, and case-based teaching as data sources, Southerland and Gess-Newsome found that positivist views of knowledge and learners interfered with candidates' development of inclusive approaches to science. The images most commonly held by the students were: (a) "knowledge is universally accepted and unchanging; (b) learners have fixed abilities; (c) learners, despite their diversity, are to be helped to achieve standard norms" (p. 139). The authors concluded from these results that in order to overcome this problem, prospective teachers need to be familiar with science content as well as a diverse student population. Furthermore, they argue that prospective teachers need to become aware of their own racial and cultural roots in order to be prepared to understand the cultures of their students.

Studies on a course with field experience connected to a school and/or community. There are two studies located in this category, and both reported a positive impact on the teacher candidates' development of equity pedagogy. Barton's (1999) study examines her multicultural science education course with a service learning component for preservice science teachers. The structure of this course consisted of three specific,

intertwining structures: (a) a 2-hour reading-based seminar twice a week, in which the preservice students explored various theoretical and practical ideas regarding science education, multicultural education, and urban education, (b) biweekly lesson planning and debriefing sessions, and (c) team tutoring of homeless shelter children for 4 hours each week (2 hours twice a week). The analysis of data, such as all eight participants' journals, field notes, focus groups, and interviews, showed that the participants changed their views about multicultural science education from regarding it simply as "adding activities that showed how science was done in other cultures" (p. 307) to conceptualizing it as "a way of thinking about science and a way of doing science" (p. 308). As a conclusion, she contended that the service learning project provided the preservice teachers with a variety of opportunities to explore education in out-of-school settings, develop social and interaction skills, gain greater awareness of other cultural and social norms and values, and develop an understanding of how to use science education related to social and cultural diversity. Very similar to this study, Hammond (2001) reported how she and her preservice teachers collaborated with teachers and Hmong parents to develop a culturally relevant science project. Although the focus of her study was on the transformation of feminist, multicultural science rather than on its influence on preservice teachers, her preservice students experienced culturally relevant pedagogy.

Xu (2000) also conducted a similar study of her literacy methods course that was connected to field experiences in classrooms 3 hours per week for 8 weeks. During the field experience, the 20 primarily White middle class preservice teachers taught two whole class literacy lessons, and conducted case studies of individual students. Analyzing six sets of

data drawn from preservice teachers' autobiographies, case study students' biographies, cross-cultural analysis charts, case study reports, Strategy and Literature sheets, and field notes of observations and class discussion, Xu maintained that the ABC's Model used in this study fostered respect for students' cultural, linguistic, and life experiences. The students used strategies such as multicultural integration and cooperative learning during reading and writing instruction with case study students to maximize the students' active engagement and promote success. As such, in conclusion, she maintains that preservice teachers in this study began a journey toward culturally responsive teaching.

Studies on school-based field experience. As stated earlier, since the studies of school-based field experiences have usually focused on the influences of both internships and student teaching experiences on teacher candidates, and do not directly relate to the matter of equity pedagogy, only two studies are located in this category, and the findings are rather mixed.

Tellez (1999) conducted a study of how Mexican American preservice teachers used their ethnicity in their curriculum and instruction during their student teaching. For collecting data, Tellez conducted extensive interviews with 4 Mexican-American candidates randomly selected from a population of 25. Analysis of the interview data showed that, although experiences varied, these 4 were committed to incorporating aspects of their insider cultural knowledge into their teaching. For example, although there was little space for integrating the student teachers' cultural knowledge into the pre-established curriculum, these Mexican-American student teachers took advantage of some opportunities that did not affect the formal curriculum. Related to this finding, the author

contends that student teachers need to more opportunities “to infuse the curriculum with their cultural knowledge in a developmental setting” (p. 568), pointing to the fact that if the teacher candidates do not learn to do this during the student teaching period, they are unlikely to do it in their actual teaching later.

On the other hand, Canning (1995) investigated the experiences of 39 predominantly White candidates from a rural Midwestern university who volunteered to student teach in an urban, multicultural setting in the Southwest between 1993 and 1994. Concurrent with the student teaching, the student teachers completed a course in multicultural education that emphasized interpersonal and cross-cultural communication skills. They also participated in written reflections, conducted action research, and worked with Mexican-American and African-American teachers in their schools who served as bicultural mentors. Drawing on the researcher’s observations in classrooms, candidates’ reports, and interviews, Canning concluded that although open-mindedness seemed to be an important aspect of candidates’ success in the classroom, only one student teacher used the knowledge learned from methods and theory courses in making connections with the cultural heritage of the students.

Studies on community-based field experiences. Three studies are located in this category, and all three studies showed somewhat promising results in helping the teacher candidates develop culturally relevant pedagogy. For example, Bondy and Davis (2000) studied the experiences of nine White, middle-class elementary candidates who tutored African-American children in a public housing neighborhood, especially focusing on their strategies for negotiating and developing caring relationships with the children. Tutor-child

pairs met twice weekly for an hour at a tutoring site within the neighborhood, and the general role of each tutor was to help the students succeed in school. To collect data, Bondy and Davis interviewed the nine tutors twice, once near the beginning and once toward the end of the 10 weeks. Based on qualitative analysis of the interviews, they found that the teacher candidates who stuck with the tutoring initially engaged in a variety of forms of caring for the children. For example, they tried to seek information about the students from various sources, observed and listened to the students, and planned activities that incorporated this information. Although many of the participants had to overcome initial relationship problems to develop connections with their pupils, by the end of the 10-week program, eight of the nine demonstrated forms of caring that allowed them to connect with their pupils. Since the ability to establish and maintain a connectedness with students is one of the defining features of culturally relevant teaching (Ladson-Billings, 1995b), Bondy and David concluded that this tutoring experience provided the teacher candidates an opportunity to develop towards culturally relevant pedagogy.

Meanwhile, Stachowski and Mahan (1998) reported the findings of “The Cultural Immersion Projects,” which were comprised of two specific projects—the American Indian Reservation Project and the Overseas Project. The American Indian Reservation Project prepares student teachers for 17-week teaching assignments with Bureau of Indian Affairs, contract/grant, and public schools across the Navajo Nation. At their reservation sites, student teachers are required to engage in all teacher-related functions of the school, and perform at least one service learning project in the local community. The analysis of survey data from 109 student teachers showed that the students expressed positive feelings toward

the cultures and communities in which they lived, and considered the community people highly significant sources of their learning outcome. From this finding, Stachowski and Mahan contended that “important student teacher learning outcomes can come from a variety of sources—both the traditional and time proven “educator” sources within the school, *and* those people in the broader community who generally receive little or no recognition in the literature on student teaching” (p. 158, italics in original). In this study, the fact that the teacher candidates regarded people of the community or its culture different from their own as resource for learning can be considered one necessary element towards employing culturally relevant pedagogy.

Similarly, Noordhoff and Kleinfeld (1993) examined the impact of the Teachers for Alaska program on preservice students’ teaching practice. The candidates were immersed in an indigenous community, such as visiting schools serving Indian students and conducting guided observations in the schools. The researchers investigated the impact of community-based learning on preservice students’ classroom teaching by videotaping students teaching short lessons 3 times during the program. The student teachers shifted very strongly from teaching as telling and covering as much material as possible to teaching as engaging students in subject matter by using culturally relevant knowledge. The analysis of the lessons also revealed gains in candidates’ dispositions to take into account their “culturally different students’ background knowledge, frames of reference, communication styles, and vocabulary” (p. 95). The authors concluded that this shift in pedagogy, which appeared as employing culturally relevant pedagogy, was due to immersion in the community.

Summary and discussion of review of studies on both topics. The review of studies on prejudice reduction indicates somewhat different findings among the four different contexts (studies on a course, studies on a course with field experience, studies on school-based field experiences, and studies on community-based field experiences). For example, the majority of the studies in groups (a) on a course and (b) on a course with field experiences in this area showed generally positive impacts in terms of results. In fact, with the purpose of helping teacher candidates develop democratic, positive attitudes toward cultural diversity, many teacher educators either developed particular strategies or assignments in their courses, or designed their courses connected with a field experience component. However, the fact that several studies in these two contexts did not report positive impact also highlights the difficulty of changing subjects' previously held beliefs and attitudes with short-term intervention. Also, one critical limitation of the studies in these two contexts (studies on a course and studies on courses with field experiences) is that most researchers investigated the impacts of those courses immediately after the completion of the courses. Thus, it is not possible to know the sustainability of the reported changes or to know whether the candidates actually demonstrated new attitudes in their teaching. Only one study (Lawrence, 1997) tried to examine whether the changes the students experienced during a course transferred into their student teaching practice.

Among the four different contexts, studies on community-based field experiences reported the most promising results in helping the teacher candidates develop and maintain positive, democratic attitudes about cultural diversity. All four studies showed positive results. These positive findings suggest that there may be more consistent positive effects

from these kinds of experiences than from courses alone, since the common objective in providing community-based field experiences is to increase teacher candidates' awareness and acceptance of those different from themselves. But, as Potthoff et al. (2000) and Aguilar and Pohan (1998) identified, selecting appropriate sites and offering educative experiences are critical for its success.

Similarly, the review of the studies on equity pedagogy also reveals somewhat different findings among the four different contexts. For example, while the four studies on a single course showed mixed results (two produced positive impacts, but two confronted resistance), all three studies on courses with field experiences connected with a school and/or community showed positive results. One can infer the reason for this is based on the necessity of having practical experiences in understanding and employing many kinds of pedagogy. Simply discussing the theory of equity pedagogy in the classroom may not produce much impact on teacher candidates' learning, but when the candidates have some practical opportunity, such as tutoring a child, coupled with learning the theory of equity pedagogy, they may be more likely to apply equity pedagogy in their teaching. As in case studies on prejudice reduction, studies on the community-based field experiences context reported positive results in helping the teacher candidates develop equity pedagogy, but in this context the teacher candidates' learning outcome via the experiences is somewhat unclear regarding the development of equity pedagogy, such as realizing the importance of connectedness with the students (Bondy & Davis, 2000).

By synthesizing all of the reviews, I have identified one critical situation in terms of research trends in preservice teacher education. That is, little research has been done on

equity pedagogy in preservice teacher education. This neglect might contribute the teacher candidates' tendency to infer that the ultimate goal of multicultural education is simply the development of positive attitudes towards certain groups, usually historically marginalized or underserved groups. Prejudice reduction is clearly a necessary (but insufficient) step in achieving the ultimate goal of multicultural education—making society more just and equitable.

Regarding this matter, one of the current challenges the field of U.S education confronts is the provision of high quality education for “all students.” Education for academic achievement for “all students” regardless of their ethnic, racial, class, or linguistic background is a critical issue in the U.S. In fact, the current situation shows the disparity between students of color, especially African-American students, Latino students, and Native American students, versus White students in terms of academic achievement. The single most important factor in increasing academic achievement is “teacher quality” (Wenglinsky, 2000). But it has been generally agreed that traditionally teacher education has not adequately prepared teacher candidates for teaching diverse students whose backgrounds are different from their own (Zeichner & Hoeft, 1996).

Responding to this challenge, many teacher educators, during the last decade, have redesigned their coursework and fieldwork experiences to help candidates preparing to teach diverse students. Indeed, compared to Ladson-Billings' (1995a) finding that few studies until that time focused on either “prejudice reduction” or “equity pedagogy” in multicultural teacher education, the review done in this section shows that studies on those topics have increased. However, as I stated above, in order to accomplish the ultimate goal

of multicultural education—making society more just—teacher candidates need to learn to employ equity pedagogy. This learning must occur during their preparation to become teachers.

Review of Research on Social Studies Methods Courses

In reviewing the literature on social studies teacher education over the decade 1978-1988, Adler (1991) identified that “research on the teaching of social studies methods has been, on the whole, particularistic and unsystematic” (p. 211). Also, reviews of the literature (Adler, 1991; Clift & Brady, 2005) about social studies education reported that few studies on social studies methods courses had been conducted. For example, Clift and Brady’s (2005) chapter that reviewed the research on social studies methods courses and field experiences published in referred journals from 1995 to 2001, reported 11 studies related to social studies education, but only 4 studies were directly related to social studies methods courses and their impact on student teachers. Among these 4 studies, 3 studies reported generally positive results, while one study reported mixed results.

Studies reporting generally positive results. Fehn and Koeppen (1998) investigated secondary education student teachers’ responses to a document-based social studies methods course and their use of document-based instruction during their student teaching. The 16-week history-intensive social studies methods course emphasized the use of historical artifacts and documents including song lyrics, documentary films, advertisements, paintings, and oral history testimony for instructional purposes of historical inquiry. Following this methods course, the researchers examined three research questions:

(a) To what extent did student teachers use historical documents during their student teaching? (b) What were the student teachers' attitudes toward document-based instruction after their student teaching? (c) Was the methods course credited by student teachers with teaching them to use primary sources for the teaching history? (pp. 471-472). The participants of this study were 11 student teachers among 40 students in a secondary social studies education program at the university—all 11 were Caucasian; 9 preservice undergraduates and 2 preservice post-baccalaureate students; 7 males and 4 females.

Three different data sources—structured interviews completed soon after student teaching, lesson plans during student teaching, and written reflection journals during the student-teaching seminar—were collected to answer the research questions. Findings from the analysis of interviews and lesson plans indicated that all 11 student teachers incorporated document-based instruction into their student teaching. For example, they used primary sources and documents to enliven instruction and supplement texts. The analysis of the interview also showed that all participants “maintained a positive attitude toward the use of document-based instruction and expressed their intentions to use them in the future,” (p. 475) and that the methods course’s intensive focus on document-based instruction influenced their use of primary sources and documents during their student teaching.

Using his own secondary social studies methods course as a study site, Dinkelman (1999) investigated “the extent, nature, and development of critical reflection among students in a secondary social studies methods course in a research-university secondary social studies teacher education program” (p. 330). Based on his concern for developing

teacher education for democratic education, the methods course was specifically focused on developing students' abilities and dispositions for critical reflection about their work as social studies teachers. In fact, in this study, the author, as both teacher and researcher, played an active role in influencing the participants, and his teaching represented "a form of treatment" (p. 331). The study participants were 3 Euro-American students—1 female student and 2 male students.

Three main data sources were collected for this study. The primary source of the data was a series of interviews conducted with the case study participants at the start, midpoint, and conclusion of the semester. The second source of data was the researcher's observational field notes of the participants' work and participation in the class, and the third source was the assignments and other written work he collected from participants over the course of the semester. These three different sources served as triangulation for analyzing the data. In analyzing the data, the researcher mainly focused on each participant's initial frames and development over the semester in terms of being critically reflective. The findings indicated that all three participants understood and adopted certain critically reflective practices, but that the practice of and topics for reflection varied across individuals. For example, in Amy's case (a Euro-American undergraduate female, age 23), it was found that she acquired a conceptual understanding of what critically reflective teaching is and an awareness of its importance, but it was still at the individual level, not at the level of broader social conditions. In Leonard's case (a postgraduate Euro-American male, age 25, and a former Lutheran pastor), it was found that he learned the meaning of critically reflective teaching and displayed his ability to employ the term in analyzing

school practice, but did not develop its meaning with reference to democratic education. In Nick's case (a postgraduate Euro-American male, age 25), he claimed that his initial set of ideas about teaching were refined and deepened over the semester, but his critical reflection usually centered on the individual student rather than the social conditions of schooling. The course emphasis on critical democratic citizenship did not make much impact on them.

As a continuation of his first study, Dinkelman (2000) investigated the extent, nature, and development of the critical reflection and critically reflective teaching among the three secondary social studies preservice teachers who took his methods course during their student teaching semester. The study participants were the same students as the previous study. Data were collected from four different sources—(a) semi-structured interviews with each participant at the start, midpoint, and conclusion of the student teaching semester; (b) four to six observations of each participant's classroom; (c) field notes resulting from these observations and various other interactions with the participants; and (d) written artifacts by each participant such as unit plans, lesson plans, student handouts, and evaluations tools (p. 199). Analysis of these data focused on the themes of critical reflection, critically reflective teaching, social studies rationales, and democratic education. Findings showed that all of the preservice teachers showed evidence of understanding and practicing critical reflection. Also, they all engaged in active teaching during student teaching and began to develop a somewhat stronger emphasis on democratic education. As such, the significance of this study is that it “appears to contradict the notion that the influence of university-based teacher education is quickly washed out as student teachers move into their own classroom settings” (p. 217).

Study reporting a mixed result. In her case study, Angell (1998) analyzed the experiences of two preservice elementary teachers during a senior semester in which they took a social studies methods course and also engaged in a half-time student teaching practicum. Specifically, she tried to understand how their beliefs interacted with new experiences from the methods course and student teaching practicum (p. 510). The study participants were two white, middle-class, female undergraduate seniors in an elementary teacher education program at a private southeastern university. In this teacher education program, during their senior semester, the preservice teachers participated each week in two 90-minute meetings of a social studies methods class, a two-hour teaching seminar, and 20 hours of student teaching in the classroom. The social studies methods course was designed with an issues-centered approach, handling topics such as human rights and environmental issues from a global perspective to teaching social studies.

Data sources for this case study were: (a) three individual interviews conducted before, during, and after the semester; (b) observations of each participant's teaching of social studies on three occasions; (c) reflective writing by each participant during the semester; and (d) each participant's concept map of social studies at the semester's beginning and end (p. 511). The data analysis indicated contrasting results between the two participants' change in beliefs. For example, through coursework and student teaching, one preservice teacher, Margaret, not only reinforced her beliefs about creating meaningful activities for pupils, but also added the importance of reflection, critical thinking, and the exchange of different viewpoints. Also, her post-semester concept map for social studies showed that now she understood social studies as a web of interrelated categories such as

geography, history, economics, political sciences, and environmental issues. On the other hand, another preservice teacher, Holly, still retained her previous beliefs about the importance of right answers usually found in textbooks even after the semester, and her post-semester concept map of social studies was little changed from her pre-semester concept map. In short, the findings of this study suggest that the two study participants' initial beliefs appeared to be an important influence on their change of beliefs in terms of the impact of the social studies methods course. In fact, they both retained their initial beliefs. In the case of the first preservice teacher, Margaret, the course reinforced and extended her beliefs, because they were similar to the emphasis of the course. However, the other preservice teacher, Holly, also retained her initial beliefs, and hers did not change as a result of the course.

Summary of research on social studies methods courses. All 4 studies (Angell, 1998; Dinkelman, 1999, 2000; Fehn & Koeppen, 1998) directly related to social studies method courses and their impact on student teachers reviewed in this section employed qualitative methods and included a small number of participants, except Fehn and Koeppen's study that had 11 participants. While 3 studies examined the impact of secondary social studies methods courses on student teachers, only one study (Angell, 1998) was located in an elementary social studies methods course.

Both Dinkelman's follow-up study (2000) and Fehn and Koeppen's (1998) study examined how the learning experiences in social studies methods courses were incorporated into their student teaching. However, their research foci were in terms of reflective practice or document-based instruction in participants' student teaching practicum.

Neither study examined the issue of multicultural education or issues of diversity and social justice related to social studies methods courses. In short, a review of the research on social studies methods courses indicates that although there have been efforts to link social studies methods courses and their impacts on student teaching, few studies have examined how the impacts of social studies methods courses related to multicultural education are incorporated into student teaching experiences. This is why my study will focus on the impact of social studies methods courses on student teaching in terms of multicultural issues.

Summary of the Chapter: Connection to My Current Study

In this chapter, I have (a) described my theoretical position for democratic teacher education with a focus on diversity and social justice; (b) reviewed the research literature focused on prejudice reduction and equity pedagogy in preservice teacher education; and (c) briefly reviewed the literature about social studies methods courses and their impact on student teachers. Each section is connected to my current study.

The first and second sections stand as my theoretical position and belief for this study. The first section in particular, in which I described my theoretical position for democratic teacher education, clearly shows my position regarding democratic teacher education. My point here is that although democratic teacher education can be conducted in many ways such as focusing on dialogues or community building, it needs to be connected to multicultural education. In particular it should be committed to social justice in a contemporary diverse society, as multicultural scholar Gay (1997) and teacher educator

Cochran-Smith (2004) contend. In short, my argument is that without trying to accomplish social justice in a multicultural, diverse society, authentic democracy cannot be sustained and developed. Based on my position regarding democratic teacher education, I will focus on how social studies methods courses can be helpful to student teachers in understanding social justice.

The second section, in which I reviewed the research literature focused on studying prejudice reduction and equity pedagogy, goes further in explaining my position regarding multicultural teacher education. As stated in the first section, democratic teacher education needs to connect to multicultural education such as prejudice reduction and equity pedagogy. However, my contention here is that “prejudice reduction” is clearly a necessary step in achieving the ultimate goal of multicultural education, but it is still insufficient. In order to accomplish the ultimate goal of multicultural education—making society more just—preservice teachers need to learn to employ “equity pedagogy” beyond simply a “prejudice reduction” approach. As such, throughout my study, I will examine how the social studies methods course helped the preservice teachers learn to use an equity pedagogy approach in their student teaching.

The third section, which reviewed studies of social studies methods courses, directly relates to my study. The findings here show that although several studies examined the impacts of methods courses on student teaching in terms of reflective practice or document-based instruction, few studies have focused on the impact of methods courses in terms of multicultural issues. This is why my study will focus on issues of diversity and social justice in examining the impact of social studies methods courses on student teachers.

Chapter 3

Methods

In describing the methods of this study, this chapter will provide (a) the research questions, (b) my position as researcher through autobiography, (c) the interpretivist approach used as the theoretical frame of the study, and (d) the methods of the study, including the context, participants, data collection, data analysis, and ethical considerations.

Research Questions

As society in the U.S. has become more culturally, ethnically and linguistically diverse, it is generally accepted that social studies plays an important role in raising good citizens, especially related to issues of diversity, equity, and social justice. During preservice teacher education programs, social studies methods courses can provide opportunities for preservice teachers to learn about important concepts related to diversity, equity, and social justice, with the expectation that they will be able to address these concepts both in their student teaching and in actual teaching later.

Several scholars (Angell, 1998; Dinkelman, 1999, 2000; Fehn & Koeppen, 1998) have examined how the learning experiences related to reflective practices or document-based instruction in social studies method courses have been incorporated into student teaching. However, few studies have examined how learning experiences in social studies methods courses related to issues of diversity and social justice have been incorporated into student teaching experiences.

Thus, the main purpose of this study is to examine how preservice teachers who take a social studies methods course in their senior year of a teacher education program incorporate the learning from that course into their 10-week student teaching practicum the following semester, especially in terms of issues of diversity and social justice. My study examines two sets of research questions:

- c. What are the influences of a social studies methods course on preservice teachers' understandings?
 - i. What are the most important learnings for them from this course?
 - ii. How do they develop or change their perspectives about the purposes of social studies for students?
 - iii. How do they develop or change their perspectives regarding the issues of diversity and social justice?
- d. How do preservice teachers incorporate their learning from the social studies methods course into their student teaching of social studies in schools?
 - i. Is there evidence that they incorporate their learning from the methods course into their student teaching? If so, how?
 - ii. Is there evidence that they incorporate their learning from the methods course related to issues of diversity and social justice into their student teaching? If so, how?

Situating the Researcher

Autobiography. I was born as the youngest of eleven siblings in Korea to a devout Catholic homemaker and a father who ran a textile factory. As a member of such a large family, I quite naturally experienced cooperative living. For instance, toys had to be shared, differences had to be settled, and discussions often had to be held in order to make certain

decisions. Because of my mother's strong faith in Catholicism, I entered a private Catholic elementary school where two older brothers and one older sister were attending. While the school was academically excellent, it also emphasized the value of living together and community. With a religious focus, the students were taught the value of love and responsibility to society.

I went to a non-religious affiliated, public middle school and high school, because at that time the Korean school system arranged the school placements of students by a random lottery system. I should point out that in the period when I went to school, there were in fact no truly independent private religious schools, unlike in America, since even religious affiliated, private schools, whether Catholic, Protestant, or Buddhist, also had to follow a restricted government curriculum with little autonomy, with the exception of a one-hour religion class per week. This situation is still the same today; there are only five or six private schools that are fully financially independent from government subsidy and have autonomy in their curricula. Throughout my middle and high schooling, I realized that, unlike my elementary school experience, the focus was always on individual academic competition and entrance exams for the next level of school. Indeed, to gain entrance to the "good" high schools--those that focused on studying for college entrance exams--middle school students had to pass a specific exam. Likewise, to enter the highest ranked colleges or universities, high school students had to achieve the highest scores on the government-controlled entrance exam, which was offered only once a year. Because of this, the teachers at my middle and high schools always stressed the importance of exam scores. Several of my teachers even said, "You must realize that the person next you is your competitor, not

simply your friend. You need to do better than that person on the exam if you want to go to the highest ranked university.” Certainly, the attitude behind this rhetoric did not recognize the value of community or living together, but only stressed individual competition.

Although I was regarded as a good student by most of my teachers during middle and high school, I was very disappointed by the focus on individual competition. In fact, I strongly believed that there was more to school than getting good grades, such as learning the value of love and community.

When I became a high school student, I started to deliberate about my future career. Based on both the education of Sunday school at my Catholic church and my elementary school experience, I wanted to pursue a career where I could devote my life to other people and society and show the value of love in human lives. Perhaps because of the influences of my mother’s strong faith and a brother who was in seminary, I finally decided to become a Catholic priest, and I entered a seminary directly after high school graduation. Seminary life was one of best times of my life. Unlike my middle and high schools, there was no competition among seminarians in terms of getting higher grades. Rather, the seminarians helped one another in preparing for exams, sharing resources or studying together to help students who were having difficulty. In fact, we felt as if we were all in the same boat, not wanting to lose anyone while reaching our final goal of becoming priests. Also, the priests in the seminary always emphasized practicing and realizing the value of love and community during seminary life. Because of this positive atmosphere, my life in the seminary was very enjoyable.

During the summer vacation of my fifth year of seminary, as a priest-to-be, I had some experiences that sparked my interest in public education as well as religious education. The pastor of my parish asked me to take charge of a summer camp for middle and high school students. Wanting the camp to be enjoyable for the students, both as relief from their school studies and as an opportunity to express themselves, I designed the program with many small group discussions and with skit-presentation sessions, so that each student could develop and express his or her own ideas. In fact, there was no ready-made right answer for the questions guiding the discussions. What I wanted was for students to express their own thoughts using their creativity. However, during the camp, when I approached each group to check how they were doing, I was asked by all groups, “What is the right answer for this question? Would you please tell us the right answer?” Clearly, this was not what I expected; I wanted them to explore their own ideas and creativity. I pondered why they were trying to find one right answer without using their own ideas. Then, it dawned on me. Their tendency to search for right answers came from public education and especially the entrance exams. Since the usual school exams and the entrance exams were in multiple-choice form only, students were instructed to find the standard right answer. It appeared to me that they had domesticated the habit of finding one standard right answer without realizing the possibility of multiple perspectives or different creative thinking. The way their education affected the students’ loss of creativity in preference to finding one standard right answer caused me much concern. In fact, this was the crucial moment when I became interested in public education in addition to religious education.

Following my ordination, during a 4-year service as an associate pastor for two parishes, my attention as director of Sunday school, was given to helping students have opportunities to express their own thoughts and ideas. For example, in addition to the usual lectures on religious matters, the teachers of the Sunday school were directed to employ different methods such as small group discussion or creating students' own skits after showing short films. Also, for one summer camp for middle and high school students, I designed the program so that the focus was on the students' creative activities of photo presentations based on investigations of the neighborhood environment. However, during this time I also encountered a significant problem in terms of employing this kind of new method. Even though I provided the teachers with several books for facilitating such methods, the teachers themselves did not know how to effectively employ these methods. It seemed to me that the teachers, who were usually university students, had internalized their own previous education that had been focused on finding one right answer. Because of this problem, my good intention of giving the students the opportunity to express their own ideas did not always work well. This was when I began to be interested in teacher development, although in the context of religious education.

In October 1998, I came to Columbus, Ohio, having been assigned as a priest by my Korean bishop to be the minister of the Korean Catholic Community in Columbus. Although the main reason for me to come America was ministerial service, my bishop, who knew of my interest in education, also advised me to study in that field, if I had spare time. Because most members of my congregation were students at Ohio State University, my ministry responsibilities occurred primarily on the weekends, such as attending group

meetings on Fridays and Saturdays and offering Mass for the congregation on Sundays. Thus, I decided to pursue an academic degree in education, taking advantage of my spare time during the weekdays. Since I had not studied English for more than 13 years since high school graduation, I underwent intensive English study for three quarters to prepare for the TOEFL exam while also deliberating on what specific area in education I would study. Realizing that some areas required practical experience as a teacher or as a school administrator, I finally decided to pursue a master's degree in educational administration, since it had no such prerequisites.

During my first year in pursuing my master's degree, I asked my advisor, Dr. Marks, whose book I should read if I wanted to know more about the uniqueness of American education, and she recommended that I read Dewey's *Democracy and Education* (1916) and *Experience and Education* (1938). Although reading these books was difficult because of Dewey's particular writing style, I was intrigued by his ideas about democracy and education. In particular, his arguments that democracy is "primarily a mode of associated living," (1916, p. 87) and that "the school must itself be a community life in all which that implies" (ibid., p. 358) were very inspiring to me in that he was clearly elaborating on points that I imagined education should encompass, rather than merely focusing on exams and scores. His point of education for democracy, for associated living, and for community life was what really I wanted to say about the goal of education. Having read Dewey, I felt I had the theoretical and philosophical support I needed for advocating my position regarding the goal of education.

Meanwhile, Dr. Marks' class on teachers' professional development also increased my concerns about teacher education. As I had experienced the problems of teachers even in religious education in Korea, I also began to realize that to accomplish the goal of education for democracy and community life, teachers themselves needed to have democratic experiences throughout their own education. In other words, democratic teacher education is a prerequisite for democratic education. If the teachers have no experience of democratic life throughout their own education, how can they teach the value of democracy to their students?

Later I learned that such a problematic situation had already occurred in the history of the reform movements in Korean education. In both the early 1970s and the late 1990s in Korea, there were movements to adapt Dewey's ideas, especially his ideas about using a problem solving approach and learning by doing in order to provide students with "educative experiences" (Dewey, 1938, p. 28). However, in reality, the movement had little success, because the teachers had no direct authentic experiences with Dewey's ideas throughout their own education, including their teacher education programs. They claimed to be using Dewey's ideas, but in reality they taught the same as previously, not knowing how to effectively employ his ideas in actual classrooms. Indeed, the axiom "the quality of education cannot surpass the quality of teachers" seemed to have played out in the reform movements in Korean education. Indeed, my own acceptance of this axiom was the main reason why I became interested in teacher education. I thought that in order to institute educational reform in Korea, teacher education itself must first be reformed.

After finishing my master's degree in educational administration, I applied for doctoral study in same area, especially focusing on teachers' professional development. This application was denied, so I applied for doctoral study in the field of philosophy of education, with a focus on Dewey, since I had a strong desire to employ his philosophy of education in Korea. After being admitted, I studied two academic quarters under the guidance of my advisor, Dr. Smith, whose main research interest was Dewey. However, I later realized that he was not interested in the application of Dewey's ideas to teacher education; Dr. Smith claimed that he was a philosopher and was more interested in purely theoretical, philosophical matters, rather than applications to teacher education.

Thus, I transferred to a different section of the college, "Integrated Teaching and Learning," and met my current advisor, Dr. Johnston, whose main research area was teacher education. In Dr. Johnston's classes on sociocultural theory and democratic teacher education, I learned about Vygotsky's work (1978) as well as Dewey. At that time, the principles of sociocultural theory, which argue that human learning and development is influenced by social, cultural contexts, intrigued me. It appeared to me that sociocultural theories would address the problem of educational standardization in Korea, which ignores the context of individual students' cultural and historical backgrounds. Adapting this sociocultural theory, it became evident that teachers must understand each individual, especially their different social backgrounds. I transferred to the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign when Dr. Johnston moved to a new position there.

During spring break of March 2006, I visited my home country of Korea to officiate a wedding ceremony, and this time I was surprised to observe the changing demographics

in Korean society. Clearly, Korea was experiencing demographic changes because of the influx of both migrant-laborers and international marriages that are commonplace within a globalized society. The traditional view that Korea was a racially homogenous nation seemed no longer to be accurate. In fact, the changing racial demographics made me admit that dealing with the issues of diversity and social justice in the school curriculum is important in order to prepare students to live in a racially diverse society.

From my own school experiences, I knew that school curricula in Korea had not included issues of diversity and social justice. I was convinced that the subject of social studies, more than any other subject, could take issues of diversity and social justice to the students. In addition, preservice teachers should be given the opportunity to explore issues of diversity and social justice during their teacher education program so they would be able to effectively teach these issues. These experiences and purposes led to my current study.

Assumption and position as researcher. Based on the objectives of the social studies methods course in this study, which focused on inquiry process and on issues of diversity, equity and social justice, I assumed that the students would gain valuable insights from the course. It was possible that they would change their understanding of concepts and perspectives regarding social studies. I also assumed that their learning from the methods course might not directly transfer into their actual student teaching. I assumed that the influences within their particular situations would affect how and what they would teach. Knowing that they would be evaluated by their cooperating teacher and supervisor, they did not have autonomy to choose everything they would have liked to have taught during student teaching.

My own position on social studies and my experiences studying social studies in Korea also influenced the design of this study. I am convinced that the content of social studies must include more than simply memorizing historical or geographical information. The content must deal with multiple, complex perspectives of human society. However, my experiences of studying social studies in Korea indicated that social studies curricula focused on merely memorization of simple historical facts. Even the focus of citizenship education was on creating a homogenous society, never addressing issues of diversity and social justice.

This approach to social studies in Korea is still prevalent, and I think it needs to be changed. Korean society is becoming increasingly multicultural because of interracial marriages and the immigration of laborers from East Asia. The content of social studies must deal with the multiple realities of human society, and with the issues of diversity and social justice. To accomplish this change, I believe that during preservice teacher education, preservice teachers need to have opportunities to explore and understand issues of diversity and social justice.

Theoretical Framework—Interpretivist

According to Denzin (2001), three assumptions organize an interpretivist approach; “First, in the world of human experiences, there is only interpretation. Second, it is a worthy goal for researchers to attempt to make these interpretations available to others... Third, all interpretations are unfinished and inconclusive” (p. xii). He also suggests, interpretation is “to attempt to explain the meaning,” (p. 119) and the goal of interpretation

is “to build true, authentic understanding of the phenomenon under investigation” (p. 140). Adapting Denzin’s point, for the theoretical frame for this study, I employed an interpretivist approach. The point of this approach was for me, as a researcher, (a) to try to understand the experiences of the participants throughout the social studies methods course, and (b) to try to explain their teaching practices during their student teaching practicum.

Denzin (2001) also suggests that three elements—description, interpretation, and understanding— and their relationship are crucial in explaining an interpretivist approach. First, description creates the conditions for interpretation, and “is necessarily interpretive” (p. 116) because a description of any observation reflects the standpoint of the observer. Then, interpretation creates the conditions for understanding, and the goal of interpretation is “to build true, authentic understanding of the phenomenon under investigation” (p. 140). Thus, Denzin suggests that “it is not enough just to describe; researchers must produce interpretations and understandings and convey these to their readers” (p. 119). Finally, understanding refers to “comprehension or grasping of the meanings of an interpreted phenomenon” (p. 162). In short, to interpret is to try both to analyze the experiences that individuals have, and to understand the meanings of those experiences.

Employing Denzin’s interpretivist approach, I, as a researcher, attempted to understand what the participants learned from the social studies methods course, and to interpret how they incorporated that learning into their actual student teaching, with a particular focus on issues of diversity and social justice.

The Method

Case study method. The case study method discussed by Stake (1995) and Yin (2003) was chosen as the research method for this study. Stake (1995) and Yin (2003) describe case study research method as an effort to understand a complex phenomenon within the context of real life events. In the introduction of his book “Case study research,” Yin (2003) suggests:

In general, case studies are the preferred strategy when “how” or “why” questions are being posed, when the investigator has little control over events, and when the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within some real-life context. (p. 1)

Yin’s descriptions are applicable to my choice of employing a case study method for this study because (a) the purpose is to examine “how” preservice teachers who take a social studies methods course incorporate their learning from that course into their student teaching practicum; (b) I, as the investigator, have little control over what each participant teaches, which is the main event of this study; and (c) the goal is to understand the phenomena of what each participant teaches during her actual student teaching practicum.

Stake’s (1995) definition of case study also supports my choice. According to him, a case study is “the study of the particularity and complexity of a single case” (p. xi). Indeed, in this study, not only each participant’s family and educational backgrounds were unique but also each participant’s experiences and learning from taking the social studies methods course were unique and complex. Thus, my decision to employ a case study method for this study seems suitable.

Yin (2003) states that one fundamental issue in conducting a case study is the problem of defining what the “case” is (p. 22). According to him, a “case” may be an

individual, event, or entity. If an individual person is the case being studied, then the individual becomes the primary unit of analysis. He also states that there is “no broad distinction between the so-called classic (i.e., single) case study and multiple-case study” (p. 46); there are only variants within the same methodological framework. The choice is one of research design, with both single and multiple case studies included under the case study method. Thus, he suggests that in a multiple-case study, information about each relevant individual would be collected, and several such individuals or “cases” might be included (p. 23). Since in this study, there are three participants, and combined they were the primary unit of analysis, this study is a multiple-case study. Thus, when I discuss the results of my data analysis in chapter 5 and chapter 6, I will present each participant as a case as well as provide a cross-case analysis as a summary.

Context of the study. The context of this study was bounded by the elementary teacher education program at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC). More specifically, the main context of this study was situated both in the social studies methods courses at the university and in the preservice teachers’ 10-week student teaching practicum. The students who enrolled in the elementary teacher education program at the university were required to take a social studies methods course and to complete a 10-week student teaching practicum in the spring semester of their senior year. This research focused on examining how preservice teachers’ learning from the social studies methods course was incorporated into their student teaching practicum.

The social studies methods course was offered as an integrated, two semesters sequence (15 weeks in the fall semester and five weeks in the spring semester) and was

designed “to connect theory and practice of teaching social studies through the processes of inquiry and production (the creation of pedagogical practices)” (social studies syllabus, 2007). One of the major focuses of the course was addressing issues of diversity, equity, and social justice. The social studies methods course was divided into five sections taught by four different instructors, but the instructors basically use the same syllabus and teach almost the same content. To coordinate this, the faculty, adjunct faculty and/or teaching assistants had a weekly meeting for the course. More detailed descriptions about the course will be provided in Chapter 4.

The students in the teacher education program at the university completed a 10-week student teaching practicum in their assigned classroom in the spring semester of their senior year. During this 10-week practicum, they were required to complete at least 3 weeks of full time student teaching. This study focused primarily on analyzing the students’ teaching of social studies in their student teaching placement, particularly issues of diversity and social justice.

Participants of the study. Although the social studies methods course was divided into five sections taught by four different instructors, in recruiting the voluntary participants for this study, I limited myself to three sections taught by three different instructors. This decision was based on practical concerns; I wanted to actually observe the weekly class sessions, and some sections were taught at the same time. Each section generally followed the same syllabi and covered the same content, although there were some variations depending on the instructor. In recruiting the voluntary participants, I also excluded the

students who would be teaching in the Chicago area for the spring semester, since traveling to Chicago to observe their student teaching was not practical for me.

After getting IRB approval and permission from the three instructors, I was given an opportunity in October 2007 to explain my study to the students and ask for volunteers. When explaining my study to the students, I intentionally did not mention to them that the focus of my study will be on the matters of diversity and social justice in teaching social studies after taking this methods course; rather I simply described the purpose of this study was to examine how preservice teachers who take a social studies methods course incorporate the learning from the course into their student teaching practicum. The reason for this was that I didn't want to create a situation where volunteer participants intentionally would include multicultural issues or issues of diversity and social justice in their student teaching of social studies because of the purpose of this study. In other words, I wanted to conduct this study in as natural a situation as possible without participants' purposeful inclinations.

Seven students from the three sections volunteered to participate (three students, one student, and three students, respectively). In December 2007, students were given information about where their student teaching placements would be in the spring, so it was not possible until early January 2008 to know whether these seven students' cooperating teachers would allow me to observe their student teaching. After meeting with their cooperating teachers in early January 2008, three students informed me that their cooperating teachers did not want me to observe their classrooms, leaving me with four participants.

When I started the classroom observations of these four students in February 2009, one student, Katie, told me that she would not have many opportunities to teach social studies during her student teaching practicum. Her cooperating teacher's concentration subject was science, and social studies lessons were taught by another teacher. This meant that I had three participants, Susanna, Julie, and Emily. Figure 1 provides basic information about the three participants for my study. More detailed information about the participants will be described in Chapter 4 along with the analysis of the data for each participant as a case.

Name	Susanna	Julie	Emily
Race	Hispanic	White	White
Age	Early 20's	Early 20's	Early 30's
Instructor of the social studies methods class	Ana	Helen	Sophie
Student teaching placement in spring semester	5th grader gifted classroom in an urban elementary school	6th grade social studies classroom in an urban middle school	4th grade classroom in a rural elementary school

Figure 1. Basic information of three participants

Data gathering. The data I collected came from multiple sources—formal interviews, class observation, and documentation—in order to answer the two sets of

research questions in this study. Figure 2 shows the research questions and the data sources used to answer each research question.

Research Questions	Data Sources
(a) What are the influences of a social studies methods course on preservice teachers' understandings?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Transcripts of formal interviews ■ Copies of weekly response papers and course assignments
(b) How do preservice teachers incorporate their learning from the social studies methods course into their student teaching of social studies in schools?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Transcripts of formal interviews ■ Observational field notes and informal conferences ■ Copies of lesson plans written by the participants

Figure 2. Research questions and data sources

Formal interviews. Three formal semi-structured interviews with each participant were conducted and addressed both research questions. Each interview lasted approximately 50 minutes to one hour. They were audio-taped with the permission of the participants, and were transcribed shortly afterward.

The first formal interview with the participants was conducted after the participants completed the 15-week methods course in the fall semester. The primary focus of this first interview was to get information about the general background of each participant, and to ask her to describe the most important things she had learned from the 15-week class. (See Appendix A for the first interview protocol.) In particular, the participants were asked to describe family background, general educational experiences before coming to the

university, and their experiences with social studies classes in their K-12 schooling. They were also asked to identify what they had learned from the course, especially from the weekly reading assignments, course assignments, and class activities during the fall semester.

The second interview with each participant was conducted after the participants had completed the five-week course in the spring semester. This second interview was focused more on asking the participants to describe their perspectives about social studies and their understanding of the issues of diversity and social justice. They were also asked to identify the most important things they had learned from the five-week class. (See Appendix B for the second interview protocol.) Because I wanted to document fresh memories regarding the participants' learning from each semester of the course, I conducted both the first and second interviews directly after each semester's classes were over.

With the purpose of addressing the second research question, the third interview was conducted directly after the participants' 10-week student teaching practicum. This interview focused mostly on experiences of their student teaching. In particular, they were asked to describe their teaching of social studies, including the purposes of their lessons. They were also asked to identify in what ways they had tried to address issues of diversity and social justice in their student teaching. (See Appendix C for the third interview protocol.)

In addition to the interviews with the participants, one formal semi-structured interview with each cooperating teacher was conducted after the participants completed their student teaching practicum in May. This interview also lasted about 50 minutes to one

hour, was audio-taped with the permission of the cooperating teachers, and was transcribed shortly afterward. The reason I conducted this interview was because I thought that there could be some points that I might have missed, considering the fact that my classroom observations were periodic. The primary purpose was to get the cooperating teacher's perspective on the participant's student teaching, particularly as it related to social studies lessons. (See Appendix D for the cooperating teacher interview protocol.)

Class observation. For my fieldwork, I conducted two different class observations for this study—the first was observing the social studies methods course sessions in the university both in the fall semester of 2007 and the spring semester of 2008, and the other was observing each participant's student teaching classroom throughout the spring semester, from February, 2008 to May, 2008.

First, I observed most of the class sessions of the 20-week social studies methods course, although data gathering was not focused on the study participants. The primary purpose was for me, as an international student and a researcher, to get acquainted with the content of the social studies methods courses. During these observations, I took field notes. These field notes were a primary data source used to develop the course description in Chapter 4.

Second, for the second research question, I conducted intensive observations of each participant's student teaching classroom throughout the spring semester of 2008. While doing this fieldwork, three different timetables of class visits and observations were completed—(a) an initial full-day class observation in February 2008 before the participants started their 10-week student teaching practicum; (b) two half-day or full-day

class observations before the participants started their three-week full time student teaching during the 10-week student teaching practicum; and (c) almost everyday observation of social studies lessons taught by the participants in April and May, 2008, while the participants were completing their three-week full time student teaching. Figure 3 provides detailed information about how many times I observed each participant's student teaching classroom.

	Number of class observations before 10-week student teaching practicum in February, 2008	Number of class observations before starting 3-week full-time student teaching	Number of class observations of social studies lessons during 3-week full time student teaching	Total number of class observations for each participant during this study
Susanna	1 full-day	2 full-day	13 lessons	16
Julie	1 full-day	2 half-day	13 lessons	16
Emily	1 full-day	2 full-day	11 lessons	14

Figure 3. Detailed information of class observation for each participant

In the following, I will describe these classroom visits in more detail. First, I made an initial class observation for each participant in February 2008. While the students were taking the five-week social studies methods course during the spring semester, they were simultaneously spending two and a half days each week in their student teaching classrooms, though they weren't taking much responsibility for teaching lessons. I observed each participant's student teaching classroom for a whole day, from when the children arrived in the class in the morning until they were dismissed in the afternoon. The primary focus of my observation was on getting acquainted with each participant's student teaching classroom context. For example, I took field notes about the demographics of the class, physical arrangements of the classroom, and class schedules, including routine procedures

in the morning, during lunchtime, and for dismissal in the afternoon. In addition, to get to know more about the class, whenever possible I had small chats with the participants' cooperating teachers. This initial class observation provided me with basic information about each participant's student teaching classroom context.

Next, I observed each participant's student teaching classroom two times between late February 2008 and early April 2008. This was before the participants started to take on full responsibilities for their three-week full time student teaching during their official 10-week student teaching practicum. During this period, a full-day class observation was done two times for both Susanna and Emily, while a half-day class observation was done two times for Julie, since Julie's afternoon class was a mathematics class. It appeared that during this period, the participants were occasionally given opportunities to teach. For example, Susanna taught some lessons for math and writing workshop, while Emily taught some lessons for social studies and math. In Julie's case, she was allowed to teach social studies lessons four times. The focus of my observation during this period was on getting to know how well the participants were doing in their student teaching classrooms, especially in terms of their relationships with their cooperating teachers and the students. Accordingly, I tried to take field notes on most of the conversations that the participants had with their cooperating teachers and the students during my observation, in addition to taking field notes about the lessons taught by each participant.

Then, while the participants were completing their three-week full time student teaching in April and May of 2008, I observed all social studies lessons taught by the participants every day. This was possible because each participant's social studies lessons

were taught during a different time slot during the day. While Susanna's social studies lessons took place from 10:45 to 11:30 AM everyday, Emily's social studies lessons were from 2:00 to 2:30 PM, Julie taught the same social studies lesson four times each day. Thus, during this period, my usual daily class observation schedule was as follows: (a) observing Julie's first and second social studies lessons from 8:49 to 9:32 AM and 9:36 to 10:19 AM, respectively; (b) observing Susanna's social studies lessons from 10:45 to 11:30 AM; and (c) observing Emily's social studies lessons from 2:00 to 2:30 PM. After each observation, a short informal conference with the participants about each lesson was conducted, either directly after the lessons or via e-mail. While each conference with both Susanna and Emily was done directly after the lessons, in Julie's case it was done through e-mail communication, due to my tight observation schedule. Examples of the questions during this conference were: (a) What was the lesson about?—What are the lesson's goals, objectives, and contents? (b) How did you feel about how the lesson went? (c) What did you think the students learned? (d) Did you do any assessment of students' learning and did you learn anything from it? (e) If you do this same lesson later, what will you change about this lesson? (f) For preparing this lesson, did you use anything (any learning) from social studies methods course? (g) What did you feel were difficulties or obstacles when you prepared this lesson? and (h) For preparing this particular lesson, did you think about addressing issues of diversity or of social justice? These short informal conferences after my observations resulted in valuable data for analyzing their social studies lessons.

Documentation—weekly response papers, course assignments, and lesson plans.

As one data source related to the first research question, copies of each participant's weekly

response papers and course assignments from both semesters were collected. Because the students were required to write a weekly response paper on their reading assignments each week, I didn't have to ask the participants to do extra work. At the end of both semesters, Susanna and Emily allowed me to copy their original weekly response papers, while Julie sent hers to me via e-mail. They also sent copies of their course assignments to me via e-mail.

Social studies lesson plans from their student teaching periods, a data source related to the second research question, were also collected. They either e-mailed me the lesson plans before my observation or gave them to me when I arrived for the observation. These documents of weekly response papers and lesson plans were valuable resources in analyzing both the participants' experiences related to the social studies methods course and their teaching of social studies lessons.

Data Analysis. Stake (1995) stated, "Analysis is a matter of giving meaning to first impressions as well as to final compilations. Analysis essentially means taking something apart" (p. 71). Keeping this statement in mind while conducting data analysis for this study, I tried to identify what was meaningful in my cases related to my two research questions.

My data analysis was based on my two research questions, although I underwent different processes in addressing each question. For example, in order to answer the first research question, I primarily relied on each participant's first and second interviews. This decision was based on my expectation that the three sub-questions of the first research question could be answered in the first and second interview. In analyzing these interview data, I employed a grounded theory coding method (Charmaz, 2002; Lincoln and Guba,

1985). This meant that rather than having *a priori* prescribed themes, I carefully read the transcripts of interviews, and started coding by identifying significant themes. Examples of the themes that I identified include: the purpose of social studies, the significance of social studies, particular examples of learning from the methods course, and learning related to issues of diversity and social justice.

While coding transcripts of the first and second interviews based on these identified significant themes, if the interview referred to particular course assignments or particular influences from the course readings, then I referred to the interviewer's course assignments, including the weekly reflective response papers about the course readings. Thus, it was possible for me to find relations between the interviews and the course work.

For the second research question, I paid direct attention to the participants' teaching of social studies lessons. I tried to search for how the participants had incorporated their learning from the social studies methods course into their actual student teaching of social studies. More specifically, I looked for incidents where they used strategies or activities that they had learned in the social studies methods course, or to what extent they addressed issues of diversity and social justice with the students. Therefore, I primarily relied on the field notes of my classroom observations to address the second research question. Both the transcript of the third interview and the students' lesson plans worked as supplemental sources if I needed clarification or additional information when I analyzed the field notes.

In analyzing my field notes, I adopted several strategies from what Emerson, Frentz, and Shaw (1995) suggest in *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*, although I didn't exactly follow the entire analytical process they suggest. Examples of the strategies that I

employed were close reading, writing initial memos, and integrative writing. The overall analytical process for my field notes was that (a) I started to read my field notes carefully based on my second research question and wrote initial memos on significant incidents or occasions I identified, and (b) after finishing the initial analysis of all of my field notes, I clustered my initial memos of significant incidents or occasions, and then I started integrative writing to present the analysis.

As a multiple-case study, I also conducted cross-participant analysis after analyzing each participant's data and writing a narrative account. In doing this, my primary focus was on significant similarities and differences. The results of the cross-participants analysis are presented in Chapter 4.

Credibility. As a researcher, I must remain credible; therefore, this study followed guidelines set forth by Lincoln and Guba (1985). They suggest that a researcher should address issues of credibility through prolonged engagement, persistent observations, triangulation, referential adequacy, peer debriefing, and member checking. To build credibility for this study, I used triangulation, prolonged engagement, persistent observations, and member checking.

Triangulation. Triangulation in the case study method basically entails verification processes that the researcher undertakes in order to increase the credibility of the research. According to Stake (1995), a researcher can use any of several triangulation protocols, including data source triangulation, investigator triangulation, theory triangulation, and methodological triangulation, in order to (a) gain the needed confirmation, (b) increase credence in the interpretation, and (c) demonstrate commonality of an assertion (p. 112).

For this study I incorporated methodological triangulation to increase the confidence in my interpretation of the data. This means that I collected data from multiple sources, such as interviews, field observations, and documentation, to increase the credibility of my interpretations.

Prolonged engagement and persistent observation. Throughout this study, I conducted two different class observations, both of which could be described as persistent. First, I observed most class sessions of the social studies methods course for the two semesters. This allowed me to document the contents of the social studies methods course, and my field notes of these observations were used to develop the course descriptions in Chapter 4.

With the purpose of answering the second research question, during spring semester, I also intensively observed the participants' student teaching classes, especially their social studies lessons. For each participant I had at least 14 observations of student teaching. This included three full-day observations and 11 observations of social studies lessons.

Member checking. Stake (1995) states that case study participants can help triangulate the researcher's observations and interpretations through a process called "member checking" (p. 115). During member checking, the participants are asked to review the materials, such as interview transcriptions or rough drafts of writing, for accuracy and palatability.

Member checking during this study was completed in two ways. After I typed up the transcriptions of each interview or taped informal conversation, I sent them to the

participants via e-mail for review. This kind of member checking was necessary for me because English is my second language. All three participants read all of their interview transcriptions, and in some cases they provided more information about what they had said, providing me with more accurate interview data.

In addition, during the data analysis, I sent rough drafts of my data analysis to the participants by e-mail. I got responses from two participants, Susanna and Julie, but not from Emily. Overall, they did not indicate any objections to my analysis, but in some cases, they provided clarification to my analysis. Their feedback was integrated into my writing.

Ethical Considerations. Ethical considerations were addressed through a variety of different approaches. In order to ensure both anonymity and ethical treatments of the participants, Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval was obtained. In addition, I completed the online ethical training course required by the university IRB office. Each participant was provided with an informed consent form, which provided an overview of the study, contact information, and general information regarding confidentiality. The participants were given the right to withdraw or not answer a question at any point in the study without repercussions.

Besides IRB approval, in considering ethical issues, I was careful about issues of privacy and confidentiality because I knew this study was personal and dependent on my relationship with the participants. Also, I tried to develop a rapport with the participants, so that they would not feel offended when talking about and interpreting their ideas and teaching practices.

Chapter 4

Description of the Social Studies Methods Course

Before providing the discussion of the findings from each three participants related to my two research questions in chapter 5, this chapter provides a detailed description of the social studies methods course, one of contexts for this study. In fact, the rational for providing this description relates to the main purpose of this study. The main purpose of this study was to examine how preservice teachers who took a social studies methods course in a teacher education program incorporated their learning from the course into their 10-week student teaching practicum, especially in terms of issues of diversity and social justice. Accordingly, it is essential to provide detailed information about the ways the social studies methods course prepared the preservice teachers to teach the subject of social studies.

I observed most of the class sessions of the 20-week social studies methods course, both in the fall semester of 2007 (15-week) and the spring semester of 2008 (5-week). In doing this, my primary concern was not on the study participants. Rather, by taking field notes, I focused on documenting how the methods course was designed and taught to the preservice teachers.

Before actually observing the social studies methods course, I simply assumed that the course would mainly focus on teaching methods or strategies related to social studies because its title was “Teaching Elementary Social Studies ”(Fall, 2007) and “Issues and Practices in Addressing Diversity in Elementary Education” (Spring, 2008), and it was one of required methods courses for the elementary teacher education program at UIUC.

However, as I observed the class sessions, I realized that my assumption had been incorrect. While the course covered teaching methods, providing the preservice teachers with opportunities to participate in many simulations and role-play activities, the course was not limited simply to teaching strategies or methods. In fact, the course had also clearly been designed with the intention of changing the students' concepts and perspectives related to social studies education. To that end, the course was designed around five conceptual frameworks: (a) What is/are social studies; (b) Inquiry as a teaching tool; (c) Teaching for cultural relevancy; (d) Teaching for social justice; and (e) Integrating social studies with different subjects (social studies syllabus, 2007). These five conceptual frameworks were represented throughout the course readings, activities, and assignments. The ways in which each of these five frameworks were represented in the social studies methods course will be discussed as a way of providing a description of the course. In doing so, although I observed three different class sessions taught by three different instructors (Ana, Helen, and Sophie), my descriptions will focus on the common aspects among the three instructors, rather than on feature unique to a certain instructor. Likewise, the primary reason for my use of vignettes, which in themselves are obviously specific to one instructor, is to provide a concrete example of a conceptual framework used by all three instructors, rather than to show a unique picture of an instructor's class. The faculty, adjunct faculty, and/or teaching assistants teaching the five sections of the social studies methods course used the same syllabus and met weekly to plan their classes, so although there were differences among the approaches and styles of the different instructors, there were many similarities among the courses as well.

What Is/Are Social Studies

One goal of the social studies methods course was to help the students develop their perspectives about what social studies is. In particular, the course provided opportunities for students to think about what disciplines are included under the umbrella of social studies education, and what social studies means, both for them and the larger society.

It was the first day of the course. Since the classroom had already been set up to have four big tables, the students naturally sat down in four groups. The class size was 27 students, the majority of whom were white female students, with two white male students, two Asian-American female students, and two African-American female students. As an introductory activity, the students participated in peer interviews using a “Developing your interviewing skills” handout. Because there was an odd number of students, the instructor, Helen, also participated in this activity. Two people, as a pair, interviewed each other about themselves, their families, their cultures, and their schooling, and later each one introduced his/her partner to the group. When Helen asked the students, “What did you learn from this activity?” one student answered, “We learned about other people’s social contexts.” After finishing this activity, Helen wrote, “What is social studies?” on the whiteboard, and asked the students to try to answer the question. One student said, “History,” and immediately another student said, “Geography.” Whenever the students gave an answer, Helen wrote it on the whiteboard. One white female student suggested, “Cultural studies, such as learning about values, morals, religion, and people.” “Speak up with your ideas. Don’t hesitate,” Helen encouraged the students. Some other students gave answers such as “sociology,” “political sciences,” “learning about countries,” “philosophy,” and so on. Soon the whiteboard was filled with such vocabulary as “history,” “geography,” “sociology,” “political science,” “government,” “anthropology,” “economics,” “cultural studies,” “learning about countries,” “globalization,” “war and peace,” and “philosophy.” When it appeared that there would be no more new answers from the students, Helen distributed a handout titled, “Some key ideas and concepts for history and the social sciences” to the students. She started to explain the handout. “Most of your answers about ‘what is social studies?’ are quite correct. In general, it is viewed that social studies is combined with seven disciplines: history, sociology, geography, economics, political sciences, anthropology/archaeology, and psychology. Also, each discipline has its unique key ideas and concepts. For example, in history, the key concepts are continuity and change, exploration, historical bias, and historical

records. In economics, the key concepts are goods, services, production, trade..." Helen also mentioned "NCSS Standards/10 themes" from the handout: (a) culture, (b) people, places and environment, (c) production, distribution and consumption, (d) global connection, and so on, and said that these themes would be addressed throughout the course. Then, Helen gave the groups some discussion time to try to recall their best and worst social studies schooling experiences, especially in terms of content, pedagogy, and teachers. Later, the students shared vivid descriptions of their previous experiences with social studies education as a whole group. Next, Helen again wrote on the whiteboard, "Social studies is about analyzing and understanding society." She continued explaining the basic meaning of social studies, writing on the whiteboard, "(1) Broadening one's perspectives; (2) Learning to appreciate multiple perspectives and meanings; (3) Developing skills necessary for 'active participation' in a democratic society." When she explained these topics, she emphasized the fact that social studies can be "everyday" and "everywhere," and asked the students to discuss what characteristics and norms are needed for achieving these meanings for social studies education. The answers volunteered by the students included "open-mindedness," "non-discrimination," "citizen participation," "respect and value for differences," "willingness to share and be exposed," and so on (fieldnotes from social studies methods course, 8/24/2007).

As the vignette above from Helen's class shows, as the opening lesson of the whole course, the students were given time to think about "What is social studies?" and were taught what disciplines are included under the umbrella of social studies. They also briefly learned what meanings social studies education has for them and for society, and discussed what norms are needed to accomplish the goals of social studies education. Overall, it appeared that this opening lesson succeeded in helping the students further develop their own perspectives about what social studies is, and the implications of that meaning for social studies education.

As will be discussed later in the analysis section for each participant, two participants in this study, Susanna and Julie, clearly identified that they broadened their perspectives about social studies by taking the course, especially in Julie's case, in which she referred to that first day of class being a big factor for her change in perspective,

because she had regarded social studies as only history-based before taking the course (first interview with Julie, 2/7/2008). It is probably safe to assume that even this short lesson on the first day class helped students who had regarded social studies as simply history or geography before taking the course, like Julie, broaden their perspectives about what social studies is. Besides this lesson on the first day, several weekly reading assignments also led students to a wider understanding of social studies. For example, as a reading assignment the third week, students were asked to read Steffey and Hood's (1994) Introduction, which clearly stated that many disciplines, including sociology, political sciences, anthropology, psychology, geography, economics, and history, belong under the umbrella of social studies.

Indeed, throughout the course, students were exposed to many disciplines, such as history, geography, and economics, through class sessions and weekly reading assignments (see Appendix E: the syllabus of the course). In particular, sizeable portions of the class were devoted to the many topics in history. One of the history topics that the students learned about and discussed was the history of many different racial groups in the U.S., by reading Takaki's (1993) *A Different Mirror: A History of Multicultural America*, one of the required textbooks in this course. This book was so focused on presenting the voices of racial minority groups in the U.S. such as Native Americans, Mexican Americans, African Americans, Japanese Americans, and Chinese Americans that the students were able to realize how American society has become multiracial and multicultural. This was history told from the point of view of minority groups rather than from a Eurocentric perspective.

Another topic the course dealt with was the use of trade books to show different perspectives on historical events. For example, during one class session, the students

examined several different trade books that dealt with the story of Christopher Columbus and compared how the stories of Columbus in the trade books differed from the stories in textbooks. Through this lesson, the students came to realize that what they had learned about Columbus from their social studies textbooks in their own schooling had been merely one account among many in terms of interpreting historical events—for example, the statement that “Columbus discovered a new land” was a viewpoint from a European perspective, but there were other perspectives. They came to understand that history has multiple perspectives, and that the mainstream history textbook typically reflects a white European perspective.

The course also dealt with several other topics related to history, including (a) using personal and family history to show that anyone can be a historian; (b) using primary sources, including historical documents, photos, and posters, in history lessons; and (c) utilizing field museums for history lessons.

Whatever topics were taught regarding history, one significant point the course continually underlined was that history has perspectives, and is not neutral or value-free; thus history always involves interpretation by someone. Indeed, the course tried to help students realize the importance of analyzing whose perspectives or voices are included or missed whenever they study historical events and stories.

Besides the subject of history, the course also provided opportunities to study particular topics in geography and economics. For instance, as a geography lesson, the students learned the differences between the Mercator and Peters world maps—While the Mercator map, popular in schools and well known to ordinary people, was developed for

navigation purposes, the Peters map was designed to portray actual size. Here the important lesson was that maps have intentions or purposes. As an economics lesson, the students learned seven Illinois standards for economics: economics, resources, consumption, goods and services, capitalism and socialism, democracy, and American dream and meritocracy. They also studied five basic economic concepts: choices, scarcity, opportunity costs, indirect consumption, and decisions. In addition, the course touched on the severe disparity in the world in terms of wealth. More detailed information about the course's treatment of economics will be discussed later in conjunction with other frameworks, such as teaching social justice.

Inquiry as a Teaching Tool

Emphasizing inquiry in teaching and learning was another conceptual framework that the course focused on. The main purposes of this framework were (a) to help the students make relevant connections with their own lives and interests, (b) to empower the students as meaning makers, and (c) to provide learning opportunities for the students to learn from inquiry experiences (social studies syllabus, 2007).

This framework was represented most prominently in the course assignments. For example, the students were required to conduct three social inquiries as course assignments, titled (a) Your School Community, (b) Crossing Borders, and (c) Child/lesson Study. The purpose of requiring these three social inquiries was to provide students experience with the inquiry process and to help them, as social educators, “do social studies—to experience and to be an active participant in social studies” (social studies syllabus, 2007).

The school community inquiry was conducted in groups of four to six, and the students researched the schools and communities where they were placed in the fall semester. The primary purpose of this assignment was to provide an opportunity for the students to get to know as much as possible about the communities their schools serves and to which their students belonged; another major goal was to give students experience in the methods of social study, which is sometimes understood as social science inquiry or historical inquiry (social studies syllabus, 2007). For this assignment, students were first asked to take a tour of the school neighborhood, and to conduct interviews with school and community members. Then, they were given a choice of conducting either a social science project or a history project. If the students chose a social science project, they were to assume to role of sociologists, anthropologists, or political scientists. For example, as anthropologists, they could try to look at the community's culture, and to find out the various ways in which its customs and social relationship form a sense of coherence in that particular group. Or, as political scientists, they could focus on finding out which particular group's power dominated the community. On the other hand, if the students chose a history project, they could research the origins of the school's name, the story of how the community was founded, or interesting aspects of the community's history by using artifacts, historical documents, and oral narratives. After conducting their inquiry, the students presented the products of their inquiry to the whole class, and submitted written reflections on both the process and content of their inquiries.

The "Crossing Borders" inquiry was created based on the idea that "students must cross cultural boundaries to learn about historically marginalized groups" (Hyland &

Noffke, 2005). For this assignment, the students had to choose such activities as attending a religious or cultural event in which they would be the minority, thus allowing them to cross cultural boundaries and learn from people who were different from them (social studies syllabus, 2007). For example, the students, individually or in small groups, visited religious or community events such as traditionally Black churches, mosques, Jewish services, gay and lesbian meetings, nursing homes, or homeless shelters--places they ordinarily never went to. After conducting this inquiry, the students had an in-class discussion based on their experiences. During this discussion, almost all of the white students who visited a Black church confessed that they were impressed by how welcoming the African-American people at the Black church were to them. Likewise, the students who visited the mosque also described how welcoming the people in the mosque were, and stated that they had learned many new things about Muslim culture. Meanwhile, an African-American student explained her difficulties being a minority, such as always having to switch cultural norms between school and home. It appeared that her statement led white students to realize how whites were privileged since they didn't have to learn new cultural norms for school (fieldnotes from social studies methods course, 10/18/2007). After this discussion, the students were asked to submit written reflections including their assumptions prior to the event or activity, their experiences, and what this inquiry taught them.

The child/lesson study had two distinct purposes—providing an opportunity for the students to understand the “process” of child learning, and allowing the students to learn about their own planning. This inquiry had two interconnected parts. First, students were grouped their placement grade level. In consultation with their cooperating teachers, they

were asked to select an age appropriate social studies concept. The concepts selected were diversity, respect, friendship, family celebration, law, insider/outsider, and multiple perspectives. Then, each student was required to conduct an interview with a child to learn about the child's current understanding of that concept. Second, information from the interviews with the children was shared with group members and used to plan a lesson addressing that concept. After each student taught the lesson the group members had prepared together, the group discussed the outcomes of their lessons and wrote a three- to four-page paper addressing what they had learned about concept formation in children and lesson planning. In the paper, students were asked to answer such questions as: (a) What does this study tell you about how children understand the social world, and how does this inform your teaching? (b) How does this inquiry help in seeing how lessons build on each other over time? (c) How can you observe and gather data while teaching? and (d) What does this inquiry help you learn about planning and teaching skills? (social studies syllabus, 2007).

In addition to the three inquiries, an "inquiry unit plan" was assigned to the students as a final assignment for the fall semester. This assignment was intended to give the students "an opportunity to examine a particular approach or method of teaching social studies in depth, through working together to create lessons and a sketch of a coherent unit" (social studies syllabus, 2007). In order to help the students conduct this assignment, the course first introduced the concepts of "Enduring Understanding" and "Essential Questions" developed by Wiggins and McTighe (1998). According to Wiggins and McTighe, an enduring understanding is the "big idea that resides at the heart of a discipline

and has lasting value outside the classroom,” and an essential question is “a question that can be answered when the enduring understanding is achieved.” Some examples of enduring understanding are: (a) “conflict and change are an unavoidable part of the human experience”; (b) “conflict can be an agent for positive or negative change”; and (c) “a person’s point of view affects how he/she deals with conflict or change” (Wiggins & McTighe, 1998). Related to these enduring understandings, an overarching essential question could be, “What is the relationship between conflict and change?” Wiggins and McTighe (1998) also state, “Enduring understandings help students think deeply about what they are learning,” and “Essential questions help students take an inquiry approach.”

With the concepts of “enduring understanding” and “essential questions,” the students also studied the inquiry-based unit planning model developed by Hamston and Murdoch (1996), which has seven sequential stages” tuning in, preparing finding out, finding out, sorting out, going further, making connections, and taking action. Then, the students, in small groups, chose a particular social studies topic or concept, and developed a unit plan based on the inquiry unit planning model. Some examples of topic choices were: Western expansion, the Olympics, the Civil War, celebrations, and Herstory in America. During the last class session of the fall semester, the whole class shared their work with other classmates at the “Inquiry Fair,” and each student submitted a reflection paper on what the process of unit planning as a group taught him/her about planning a unit and teaching.

Teaching for Cultural Relevancy

The third framework that the course focused on was teaching for cultural relevancy. Over the two semesters, the course provided many opportunities for the students to think about how cultural relevancy impacts teaching and learning. In particular, the course tried to help students see social issues from a variety of perspectives and teach them to investigate issues of race, culture, gender, and sexual diversity (social studies syllabus, 2007). For example, as mentioned earlier, by reading *A Different mirror: A History of Multicultural America* (Takaki, 1993) and discussing it during class sessions, the students learned how American society has become multiracial and multicultural. Besides racial diversity, other forms of diversity, including linguistic diversity and sexual diversity, were also dealt with throughout the course.

Bilingual issues in social studies education were addressed as the main topic of one class session during the spring semester. During this session, the students learned the differences among four different methods of bilingual education—the English immersion model, the transitional bilingual model, the paired bilingual model, and the two-way bilingual model. Under the English immersion model, children whose first language is not English are taught everything in English throughout their schooling. The worst thing about this model is that it devalues the first language during one’s schooling. Under the transitional bilingual model, the children are taught mainly in their first language early in their schooling, and then gradually the instruction shifts to mostly English. Under the paired bilingual model, the children are taught with their first language and English throughout their schooling. Finally, under the two-way bilingual model, all of the children,

including those whose first language is English, learn in both languages. With this approach, all of the children are given the opportunity to learn a new language and culture (fieldnotes from social studies methods course, 1/31/2008). The students also talked about the many challenges that might exist in bilingual education. For example, they discussed a case in which a child whose first language is not English shows difficulty learning a certain subject—in this case, the teacher must identify whether the problem is subject knowledge or language barrier. In addition, the students talked about how to deal with problematic situations, such as when nobody knows the child's first language, or when the child whose first language is not English pretends he/she understands English well. In both of these situations the teacher needs to find someone who can translate for the child, or materials that use both English and child's first language, in order to facilitate the child's learning.

Also, gay and lesbian issues were dealt with at one class session in the spring semester as a topic of how to address controversial issues in social studies education. During this session, the students watched "*It's Elementary: Talking about Gay Issues in School*" by Chasnoff and Cohen (1996), which showed how gay and lesbian issues can be taught in age-appropriate ways in school. The film showed how a fourth grade teacher and an eighth grade social studies teacher each addressed gay and lesbian issues as a topic of social studies education. The film also dealt with many important questions related to gay and lesbian issues with children; thus the students were able to develop new understandings about this issue. For example, a student asked why addressing gay and lesbian issues is necessary in school; the answer was that negative language about gay men and lesbians is common on the playground, in school hallways and classrooms, and even in teachers'

lounges. In short, all children, regardless of whether they have gay or lesbian family members, are negatively affected by anti-gay prejudice in schools. Another student asked whether elementary and middle school children were too young to be introduced to the topic of gay and lesbian issues; the answer to this question was that, as the film showed, even children as young as first grade have already heard many things about gay men and lesbians outside of school, so schools need to address a topic that young children now are increasingly familiar with. The main reason why gay and lesbian issues need to be taught in schools is to create a safe environment for children to learn more about the different types of people that they will encounter throughout their lives, thus helping to prevent prejudice and discrimination (fieldnotes from social studies methods course, 1/24/2008). By watching the film and discussing several questions related to gay and lesbian issues and children, the students seemed to understand that preventing prejudice toward gay and lesbian people and respecting the lifestyles of others are the primary reasons why gay and lesbians issues should be addressed in schools.

In addition to bilingual education and gay and lesbian issues, the students had the opportunity to learn about the diverse religions that are practiced in America during the course. They read some articles that explained Islam and learned that the terms “Arabic” and “Islamic” are not interchangeable, a common misconception. While the term “Arabic” is used for cultural and linguistic identification, the term “Islamic” is used as a religious term. For example, Turkey is Islamic in that most Turkish people practice Islam, but they speak Turkish, not Islamic (fieldnotes from social studies methods course, 9/7/2007). Meanwhile, many students whose religious background was Christian visited a Mosque or

a Jewish temple for the “Crossing borders” assignment, and were thus able to obtain some knowledge about a religion other than their own.

Teaching for Social Justice

Building on the third framework, the fourth framework for this course was teaching for social justice. The course had several purposes related to this framework:

1. As students begin to think critically about power relationships in society and to understand social norms and social values from a variety of perspectives, they will try to find ways to work against inequality in society;
2. That students understand that concepts such as democracy and community are integral parts of building socially just societies both within the U.S. and internationally; and
3. That students realize that “citizenship” is an important concept in social studies and in social justice and that “global citizenship” is part of this (social studies syllabus, 2007).

In fact, the course helped the students learn about several important topics, such as white privilege in American society, the problems of racism and sexism, and economic justice in the world as pertinent topics under the teaching for social justice framework. The topic of White privilege in American society was addressed during one class session during the spring semester. During this session, the students read an article titled, “white privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack” by McIntosh (1990). This article is written by a White person on the topic of White privilege and is considered a “classic” by anti-racist educators. In this article, McIntosh critically analyzed in what ways white privilege, like male privilege, had been sustained invisibly in American society. While reading the article, each student was asked to check “yes” or “no” in response to 26 sentences that McIntosh used to

describe aspects of white privilege in American society. Following this exercise, the students wrote on the blackboard how many “yes” answers they checked, and the whole class talked about whether white privilege still exists in American society. Among the 28 students in Ana’s class, 25 students checked “yes” more than 19 times, and they all were White. During the whole class discussion, most White students confessed that they had never thought about White privilege in American society before. In particular, one African American female student talked about her own experience related to White privilege, and it appeared that listening to her experiences helped the White students realize that White privilege still exists in American society (fieldnotes from social studies methods course, 1/17/2008).

The topic of economic justice in the global world was taught during one class session during the fall semester as a sub-topic of economics.

Using the overhead projector, Sophie [the instructor] showed the students the chart, which indicated both percentage of world population and percentage of world GNP in each of six regions: Africa, Asia, Europe, South and Central America, North America including the U.S. and Canada, and Oceania. Sophie said, “On this chart, Mexico is included in the South and Central American regions in order to analyze economics in the global world, although it is geographically located in North America.”

	% of World Population	% of World GNP
Africa	13	2
Asia	61	26
Europe	12	34
South/Central America	8	5
North America	5	32
Oceania	1	1

Because “% of World GNP” on this chart represented purchasing power internationally for each region, the students were easily able to understand the disparity in terms of populations and wealth in the world. While the students looked

at this chart, Sophie encouraged them to think about the issue of economic justice in the world, and asked them to refer to websites that had information about starvation and under-nourishment in the world. After finishing the discussion about economic justice in the world, Sophie introduced the guest speaker, Janet, from Ten Thousand Villages, a local store that sells fair trade products from all over the world. As the opening of her presentation, Janet introduced the book *“If the World Were a Village”* (Smith, 2002). Using this book, she showed a variety of statistics in terms of world population. She asked all 25 students in the classroom to participate in visualizing the statistics so that the students might realize the situations more vividly. For example, she asked five of the 25 students to stand up, representing the 20% of the population who live on under one dollar a day. She also had three students stand up, representing the 12% of the world population who are able to use a computer. She continued, asking 10 students to stand up, representing the 40% of the world people who have no bathroom in their houses. After displaying the book, Janet emphasized that all of the people in this classroom were connected to the world, and that we should realize we are privileged with so much wealth here. She also said, “If you want to check how you have been living in globalized society, you should check your clothing. You can realize that the things you use every day have come from other countries. The whole world is a global village.” Janet continued to talk about issues of economic justice such as fair trade and fair wages, and explained what her store is doing in terms of fair trade in the world (fieldnotes from social studies methods course, 11/1/2007).

As the example above shows, when the course dealt with economics as one of the disciplines under the umbrella of social studies education, the students learned about economic justice in the world. In particular, this class session helped the students realize the current disparity in terms of world wealth and world population.

In addition to White privilege and economic justice, the students were also taught about media literacy, especially analyzing children’s books and movies for racism and sexism, during one class session during the spring semester. The students read an article titled, “10 Quick ways to Analyze Children’s Books for Racism and Sexism” from the book *Rethinking Schools Special Edition* and looked at several books in which African-Americans and Native Americans are negatively stereotyped, discussing the problems of

racism and sexism and the negative effect of stereotyping in current media. The students also watched some videos titled, *Children of Hope*, *Poticanto*, and *Smoke Signals*, and discussed the ways these videos facilitate racism and sexism in current society.

Also, several topics related to “global citizenship” were also addressed over the two semesters. As already mentioned, both the topic of economic justice in the world and the difference between “Arabic” and “Islamic” were taught. In addition, during one class session, a guest speaker from East Asian & Pacific Studies (EAPS) at UIUC gave a one-hour presentation about East Asia. This guest speaker, who is the educational supervisor from EAPS program, brought many materials in a big box. From this box, she took out and showed a scroll, which, according to her, was a copy of a 20-foot-long scroll from the Chinese Ching-Ming Dynasty of the 17th century. She allowed the students five minutes to look at the scroll, and then asked them what interesting things they observed. The students answered that they saw some buildings, bridges, an amphitheater, a palace, people, and so on. After listening to the students’ answers, the guest speaker explained the overview of the scroll and the ways it could be used in the elementary classroom to integrate social studies with art. After this explanation, she introduced several books, such as *The Accidental Asians: Notes of a native speaker*. (Liu, 1999) and *Foreign Babes in Beijing: Behind the scenes of a new China* (DeWoskin, 2006), which are good sources for Americans to learn about East Asians (fieldnotes from social studies methods course, 11/8/2007).

Integrating Social Studies with Different Subjects

The last framework that the course focused on was how to integrate social studies with other subjects. In particular, the course intended for the students to understand that skills learned in math, reading, writing, science, and art can be integrated with social studies, and can be used for meaningful, real-life activities (social studies syllabus, 2007). As weekly reading assignments for the course, the students read various examples of lessons that showed how to integrate social studies with other subjects, from the required books for the course, including *Integrating Socially* (Hamston & Murdoch, 1996) and *If This Is Social Studies Why Isn't It Boring?* (Steffy & Hood, 1994). By reading these examples and discussing them during class, the students were able to get practical ideas for integrated lessons for their own classrooms.

In addition to the reading assignments, several course sessions were spent providing the students with actual experiences of how to integrate social studies with other subjects. For example, at one class session during the fall semester, when the class dealt with the topic of how to use primary sources in teaching history, the students were given first-hand experiences utilizing artifacts, songs, posters, photos, and poetry for teaching history (fieldnotes from social studies methods course, 11/15/2007). Also, the students had the opportunity to learn ways that art and music can be integrated with social studies at one class session during the spring semester. During this session, the students conducted center activities, titled: (a) pop, Hip-Hop, and folk for upper elementary students; (b) African American artists; (c) Hip-Hop; (d) Hidden arts for integrating arts with school issues; and

(e) art and culture in Japan. After the students had worked at all five centers, they talked about how powerful music and visual arts are, considering the fact that music and art always represent something powerfully (fieldnotes from social studies methods course, 1/31/2008).

Other Important Aspects of the Course

Besides the five theoretical frameworks that I have discussed so far, the course encompasses three more important features: multiple perspectives, collaboration, and instructional strategies.

First, helping the students realize the importance of presenting social studies from multiple perspectives was one significant point addressed throughout the course. In fact, as mentioned earlier, reading *A Different mirror: A History of Multicultural America* (Takaki, 1993) and discussing it during class helped students realize the necessity of having perspectives of minority people such as Native Americans and Mexican Americans, in order to more fully encompass America's multicultural and multiracial society. Indeed, it appeared that reading Takaki's book helped the students realize that their understanding of American history was quite limited, and that identifying perspectives that were missing in analyzing history would contribute to a more just society.

In addition, the students were shown how to use trade books to supplement the school textbooks, in order to present children with multiple perspectives. The students read a lot of stories about Christopher Columbus and Native Americans in the children's books, and talked about what Native Americans' perspectives would be in analyzing the Columbus

narratives, and how they would be different from the White European perspective (fieldnotes from social studies methods course, 10/4/2007). In addition, as mentioned earlier, when the course dealt with the topic of maps in geography, the students had opportunities to see various styles of world maps. They learned the differences between the Mercator and Peters world maps, and also saw an unusual upside-down world map, in which the South Pole is located at the top. In particular, seeing this world map made the students realize how North America is treated as more important than South America and Oceania in world maps. They learned about the necessity of multiple perspectives even in studying maps (fieldnotes from social studies methods course, 10/25/2007).

Second, throughout the course materials and class sessions, the course tried to provide various opportunities for students to work in groups, so that they were able to have first-hand experience with group work. For example, several assignments, such as the inquiry about the school community, the child/lesson study, and the inquiry unit plan, required the students to work in groups. In addition to these assignments, sizeable class time was spent in small group discussion to allow students to talk about the main points they had learned about and what they had learned from their weekly reading assignments. By working on their assignments and discussing about what they read as a group, the students were able to share their ideas and their own experiences. Accordingly, they came to understand the benefits of working together, although group work is not always easy, and to realize the necessity of collaboration in their future teaching profession.

Third, as a methods course, the course didn't require the students to memorize social studies "facts," but it provided the students with experience with various

instructional strategies, including role-play, readers' theater, fishbowl, jig-saw, and center activities. Besides these strategies, half of the class time during spring semester was spent participating in literature circle activities. During literature circle, each student, in turn, took on a role such as passage master, discussion director, summarizer, connector, or illustrator, after reading a portion of their group's chosen book. Books that could help the students expand their understanding about diversity in schools were provided to encourage the students to think more about issues of cultural diversity and social justice in preparing for their future teaching, such as *Because of the kids: Facing racial and cultural differences in schools* (Obidah & Teel, 2001), *Confronting racism, poverty, and power: Classroom strategies to change the world* (Compton-Lilly, 2004), *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom* (Delpit, 1995), and *We can't teach what we don't know: White teachers, multicultural schools* (Howard, 2006). The course syllabus is provided in Appendix E.

Chapter 5

Findings

As findings chapter, this chapter will present the analysis of the three participants based on my two research questions—(a) what are the influences of a social studies methods course on preservice teachers' understanding? and (b) how do preservice teachers incorporate their learning from the social studies methods course into their student teaching of social studies in schools? In doing so, each participant will be presented as a case. Each case presentation has three sections—(a) family and educational background, (b) influences from the social studies methods course, and (c) an analysis of student teaching practices. Then, a summary of the cross-case analysis will be discussed in chapter 6.

Case 1: Susanna

Section 1: Susanna's family and educational background. Although Susanna comes from a biracial family (her father's background is German, and her mom is a first generation immigrant from Columbia), she identified herself as Hispanic when I asked her ethnicity. She especially emphasized the fact that half of her family spoke Spanish (first interview, 12/11/2007). She was an only child, and both of her parents worked while she was growing up. She attended public school from Kindergarten to eighth grade near her house, and then attended a private Catholic high school a half hour drive away. She grew up in a small suburb, the majority of whose residents are Caucasian. During her K-12 schooling she met only a few Asians and a couple of Black students.

Susanna studied abroad in Bilbao, Spain during the spring semester of her junior year of college, with a minor in Spanish. She said that this experience was probably the greatest thing she had done, especially having learned about living in another country, how to travel in Europe, and about different cultures. The following are several important experiences she had before coming to the university. The data source is the first interview on December 11th, 2007.

Volunteering. An important value that her parents emphasized to her was caring. This value of caring was expressed by her continuous volunteer work during her K-12 schooling. As a member of the Girl Scouts from Kindergarten to eighth grade, she participated in many different kinds of volunteering. For example, she visited nursing homes, where the Scouts sang songs or played Bingo with the residents, and she participated in food pantries and soup kitchens for the poor. The private high school that she attended required 25 hours of volunteer service per semester, and she spent fifty more hours volunteering as a member of a service club. She especially enjoyed volunteering at a nursing home in high school. She said that these volunteering practices taught her that it feels good to help other people, and that it pays off in ways which offset the lack of monetary compensation.

Loneliness as Freshman in high school. Susanna said she had hard time starting at the private high school, since she was the only one who went to that school from her entire eighth grade graduating class. She didn't know anyone, and she felt everything was different from her previous public school, so she hated it at first. Only after she made some friends by the end of sophomore year did she start to love it there. She hoped that this

experience could help her when she has new students in her teaching later, because she would be able to understand how they feel.

Jong-Hyun: So do you think that kind of experience also help to your teaching when you have new students? For example, you can think of such a situation: in your class, you have new students, no one knows these students, so kind of emotionally can you understand them?

Susanna: Oh, yeah. Definitely, like, I can connect to the way they feel. And hopefully, I'm hoping that as a teacher, I'll be able to be very, very welcoming to them, and make them comfortable in the classroom. And maybe do a lot of grouping, so they can work with a pair, maybe even the same pair, so they can grow a friendship and get to know other people. But definitely, I could definitely feel how they were (first interview, 12/11/2007).

Influence of middle school teachers. Susanna identified both her middle school experiences and middle school teachers as influential in her desire to become a middle school teacher, although she wouldn't mind teaching elementary school also. She loved all of her middle school teachers except one seventh-grade math teacher. They were her role models, because it appeared to her that they were fun and "really cool" to the students. Particularly, she remembered sixth grade as her favorite year throughout her K-12 schooling. During 6th grade, the students conducted an Iditarod project that integrated math, science, language arts, and history. Susanna recalled this project as the "coolest thing ever" in her schooling (first interview, 12/11/2007).

Experiences with the subject of social studies. While Susanna remembered the Iditarod project in sixth grade very well, she unfortunately did not remember much other content from her social studies classes during her elementary schooling. She felt sad about this. Throughout her middle and high schooling, what social studies meant to her was mainly learning about government things and geography. Also, she said that although she

could remember glazing over Christopher Columbus and some little things from social studies classes, she didn't really remember focusing on big units. In particular, because she didn't have any interest in politics and because memorizing facts about the government was boring to her, she hated social studies class in middle school. Only later in high school when she studied World History did social studies become slightly more interesting to her.

Learning about issues of diversity and social justice. When she was asked in what ways had she had learned about the issues of diversity or social justice in her K-12 schooling, Susanna answered:

I was always kind of aware of it [diversity], just because half of my family is Columbian, so I always had that half my family always spoke Spanish, and we did our cultural things together... But, as far as in the actual schooling system, I don't really remember them ever teaching us about it. But I never saw like racism in my school, I never saw anything negative about diversity in my school. So, I don't know if it was just naturally O.K., or if they taught us about it. I don't remember them ever teaching us about diversity or anything like that. I don't think they did because I think I would have remembered if they did (first interview, 12/11/2007).

As a member of a biracial family, Susanna was naturally aware of cultural or linguistic differences. In addition, studying in Spain in her junior year in university might have increased her awareness of different cultures. However, it appeared that her family background and her experience of studying abroad did not help her to think about the issue of social justice beyond diversity. Moreover, her K-12 schooling did not provide any opportunities for her to think about the issues of diversity and social justice, either. In short, although Susanna had some experience with of linguistic and cultural differences based on her family background, she didn't have any chances to learn about the issue of social justice before coming to the university.

Section 2: Influences from the social studies methods course. This section analyzes the influences of the social studies methods course on Susanna's understandings and learning. It is divided into three subsections: (a) influence on her understanding of social studies, (b) learning related to particular topics and assignments, and (c) influence related to the issues of diversity and social justice. The data sources for this analysis are mainly the first and the second interviews, her weekly response papers, her reflection papers on class assignments, and e-mail communications.

(a) Influence on her understanding of social studies. While taking the social studies methods course, Susanna developed a new understanding about the subject of social studies in several ways.

Social studies as a big umbrella. Susanna developed a broadened idea of what is included in the scope of social studies. Before taking this course, she had thought of social studies as merely learning about government, history, and geography, based on her own social studies experiences in K-12 schooling. While taking the methods course, she changed this definition.

Jong-Hyun: What kind of learning experience from this class was significant for you?

Susanna: I just thought it was interesting that, definitely, social studies is so wide. Like it encompasses so many concepts and subjects that Ana [her instructor] has really opened that up for us. Like that scroll that woman brought in, I thought it was so cool, and I never would have thought that that would fit under the social studies calendar, or social studies umbrella. So, there's such a variety, I think, is what I am getting at (first interview, 12/11/2007).

Susanna recalled the one-hour session in which a guest speaker from the East Asia Study Center came to the class and talked about some topics related to East Asia. This

speaker showed and explained a scroll depicting life in 17th century China. Susanna came to understand that showing and discussing other countries' arts can be a topic of social studies as multicultural study or global study. While she "did not think about all different topics that are encompassed in social studies how much it covers before taking the methods class" (e-mail communication, 7/17/2008), Susanna stated that she came to think that social studies included not only history and political science but even psychology (first interview, 12/11/2007). The reason why she thought that even psychology is included in social studies was because it addresses human relations and social aspects in the human world. It is apparent that she changed her concept of social studies to consider it an umbrella term encompassing many different concepts and subjects.

The purpose of social studies. Susanna stated that before taking the methods course, she did not think much about why students should learn social studies. She simply used to think that it was important to learn about history and government, without reflecting on the purpose of social studies (first interview, 12/11/2007). However, after attending the two semesters of the social studies methods course, she had developed her notion of the purpose of social studies. She expressed two reasons why we should teach students social studies: (a) being knowledgeable about the nation's history--for example, knowing how our country had gotten where it is today; and (b) knowing how to be a good citizen--for example, how to make a difference, not just in our country but in the world (second interview, 4/3/2008).

Her first purpose, being knowledgeable about the nation's history, is not much different from her previous thought that it's important to learn history. However, her second purpose, knowing how to be a good citizen in a global world, is certainly a new purpose

that she developed while taking the methods course. This is a significant change. Previously, she regarded social studies as merely memorizing historical facts. Thus, she never thought it had direct connections or impact on current society. But after the methods course, she understood that social studies could be a tool for making differences the world by teaching students “how to be good citizen in the global world.” Apparently, she had developed the view that social studies has an important value for improving current society.

Social studies can be fun. Susanna also changed her previous concept that social studies is simply “fact memorization” about history and government, and thus is “boring.”

Susanna: I learned looking at social studies from a different angle. Not just that it's facts and that you have to memorize all these facts. But you can learn about other cultures, you can learn about diversity and history, but in such a different way that it's not just facts and memorizing... I definitely think Takaki book was huge in our learning in this class. Definitely it talked about, for example, not just we came here and the Indians got moved. It talks about it from the perspectives of the Indians, too, the Native Americans, and what impact we had on them. I think the book was written not from their perspectives, but for them. Like giving them the advantage, I guess. Not just saying like “we came here, and we were a big power, and we took over.” But saying like “these people were hurt, too (first interview, 12/11/2007).

Susanna developed a new understanding that social studies includes not merely facts and memorization, but also learning about other cultures and diversity, and thinking about the perspectives of others, such as Native Americans. She especially credited the reading of Takaki's book as having had a significant impact on her new understanding. Coupled with her broadened understanding of social studies as an umbrella term, this new understanding about social studies contributed to her new conception of social studies as fun.

Susanna: The class definitely showed me that social studies can be fun... I think that social studies can be fun because it encompasses so many topics and student

could learn about so many different things and it would be very fun. For example, to look at different cultures and explore how they compare to our culture is fun. I learned different ways to make it more hands-on than just the usual textbook learning and memorization (e-mail communication, 7/17/2008).

Social studies is important. Susanna stated that before taking the methods course, she did not have many feelings towards teaching social studies, and did not feel confident teaching social studies. This seems natural if we consider that she had little memory of social studies in her K-12 schooling. However, she now attached a great value to social studies in helping students become good citizens. She believed that in order to be good citizens, students should know the world they live in, how it works, what is going on in modern times, and how to change the world for the better.

Attaching great value to social studies, Susanna clearly expressed two thoughts about social studies in terms of school curriculum. One was that social studies should be given enough time in the school schedule. During her student teaching, Susanna experienced that social studies, compared to other subjects such as math and reading, was given less time in the school schedule. Susanna expressed her desire to spend more time on social studies.

Susanna: I think it's something that, I guess, it [social studies] gets zipped time in our schedule... Math, science, and reading, you have to teach that every day, and there are certain standards you have to meet. I think social studies should be definitely included in that. I think it's super important (second interview, 4/3/2008).

The other thought that Susann expressed was that teaching social studies should be started as early as Kindergarten. Although Susanna was still not sure what kinds of things could be taught in the early grades for social studies, she said that she would probably talk about different holidays, such as Columbus Day, the 4th of July, Halloween, Thanksgiving,

etc., and do small art projects related to these holidays (e-mail communication, 8/11/2008). This seems trivial to me, and I wonder why she did not have a better sense of appropriate topics for younger grades, such as talking about community buildings or teaching about different cultures. I interpret the reason as being a lack of experience in teaching younger grades during her student teaching placements. During her three-week full-time student teaching period, Susanna appeared to try to spend more time on social studies in her teaching schedule. This will be discussed in the next section in which her student teaching practices are analyzed.

(b) Learning related to particular topics and assignments. This subsection analyzes particular topics and assignments from the social studies methods course that influenced Susanna's learning, both personally and professionally. Topics related to the issues of diversity and social justice will be discussed in next subsection.

Learning from the Columbus lesson. Susanna expressed that studying "the real" story of Columbus was one of the most valuable things that she had learned from the methods course (second interview, 4/3/2008). It was a shock to her when the class talked about lies told about Columbus, since she realized that she, as an educator-to-be, hadn't known the truth about him. She also learned that Columbus had done many bad things, such as capturing people wherever his boats landed and keeping them as slaves. Susanna thought herself as having had misconception that Columbus had discovered America, and even assumed that other students in the class, like her, weren't taught "the real" story about Columbus, before this course. Susanna stated:

The whole thing we studied about Christopher Columbus really threw me, because I honestly don't think any students are really taught "the real" story about him... I mean, it's about our country, and he [Columbus] didn't discover it, and I think that's a really big misconception that I had (first interview, 12/11/2007).

Susanna also identified that studying what she considered a more accurate story about Columbus taught her several important things directly related to her future teaching. First, it gave her new insight into how teaching impacts children's learning (e-mail communication, 7/17/2008). Susanna confessed that until this course, she thought of Columbus merely as a hero who never did bad things. Second, as a teacher-to-be, she realized the importance of knowing accurate information about historical events in order to teach children well (first interview, 12/11/2007). Third, she began to be concerned about how to address this different interpretation about Columbus, who also did many bad things. She realized that teaching the narrative from another perspective about Columbus would contradict the way this historical person is typically presented in textbooks.

Susanna: Those couples of topics are so hard to bring up in school because you go against the flow that was created already. Because when a kid comes home and says, their mom says, "Happy Columbus Day," and the kid goes, "Well, we learned about Columbus, and how he's a bad man," and what are their parents going to think when I send their kids home saying really nasty thing about a national holiday ... I didn't know that he [Columbus] did so many bad things. I think that was most beneficial to me to learn that information. Because now I have to figure out what I'm going to tell even my children about that topic, when they come school and say, "Yeah! It's Columbus Day!" And I'm going to be like, "Yeah! Let's talk about Columbus." You know, I have to decide what now to do with that information. So I thought that was the most interesting to me (second interview, 4/3/2008).

An important point here seems to be that Susanna is considering choices about what to teach, having learned that there is a more complete historical narrative of Columbus, or that there is additional historical information and additional perspectives. She understands that

this may cause some issues with parents who have not been exposed to these fuller accounts of Christopher Columbus.

Although Susanna expressed what she learned from studying the additional information about Christopher Columbus, it appeared that she didn't get the main point when one session of the methods course discussed Columbus story. During one class session, the students were given time to closely examine several trade books that presented different historical interpretations of the Columbus story that contrasted the information in the textbooks. By providing the opportunity for the students to compare different versions of the Columbus story among trade books and social studies textbooks, this class session was intended to show the students how different perspectives or point of views influence the interpretation of historical events. Also, this class session was intended to see history as interpretive or narrative that has multiple perspectives, and to realize that mainstream history textbooks typically reflect only white European perspectives. It appeared that although Susanna studied these alternative historical narratives about Columbus during this class session, she continued to simply regard history having one "truth," dichotomizing what she had previously believed about Columbus and the new perspectives from the methods class as "wrong" and "right." She didn't see history as interpretive, relying on multiple perspectives.

Crossing borders was "me learning." Susanna confessed, "Inquiry two was beneficial to my experience. It was an experience for me, and it wasn't really geared toward my teaching career per se, but it was me learning" (first interview, 12/07/2008). Inquiry two, the "Crossing Borders" assignment, was designed to have students explore cultural borders

between groups of people. For this assignment, students were asked to attend a community event or activity that allowed them to cross a border and experience people different from themselves. She chose to visit the mosque near the university with two other classmates, and they attended a prayer service and dinner there.

From this experience, she realized that many of her preconceptions about Islamic culture and its people were wrong (reflection paper on crossing border assignment). For example, she had the preconception that in Islamic culture, women are considered “lower” than men, but she learned from some of the women at the Mosque that women are more respected in their culture. Also, she previously thought that Muslims were not very open to other cultures and other people. However, they were very nice and welcoming to visitors, and open to talking about their faith to others. Susanna made connections from this experience to her teaching practice: “In my teaching not only should I be aware of the students who are members of Islamic culture, but also teaching about it. I know that like me, my students can learn more about other cultures” (reflection paper on crossing border assignment).

In fact, this was the first time that Susanna had directly met or talked with an Islamic person, and this experience increased her understanding about Islam. Responding to why she thought this experience was “me learning,” she stated:

I felt like through all of the education courses I have been taught many different ways to help others learn and thought that “this specific inquiry” was mostly not about a way that I can help others learn but about how I can still learn as a professional. This activity was a great one because it was more focused on my experiences as a person and not necessarily as a teacher (e-mail communication, 8/11/2008).

Recognizing White privilege in American society. Susanna came to recognize existing White privilege in American society from one class session during the spring semester that addressed the topic of white privilege. During this session, each student was asked to read the article, “white privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack” by McIntosh (1990) and to check “yes” or “no” to 26 sentences that described aspects of White privilege in society. Following this exercise, the whole class talked about whether White privilege still exists.

Jong-Hyun: What did you learn from discussion of white privilege?

Susanna: I learned that things aren’t equal, especially with Pauline—we had one African American girl—with her perspectives. I always thought we’ve come a long way from the Civil War, and segregation, and all that stuff. But the way we were talking about it, I still think there is White privilege. Because we talked about whether it still exists, and it does. And that really surprised me, and I think I learned to look at things in a new way, just because of things I take for granted, someone else might not get it so easily. And I guess I never noticed that before, until after we talked about it.

Jong-Hyun: So, that’s some new learning, or new perspective. Before that kind of discussion, you never thought about existing White privilege.

Susanna: Right. I thought it was all equal.

Jong-Hyun: So how did this kind of learning from White privilege also can apply to your teaching situation?

Susanna: Well, especially in my class, because my class is so diverse, definitely treating every single student the same—so they have the same opportunities, they have the same amount of responsibility as every other person in the class. So, making everything as equal as possible. Which I don’t think is that hard in the classroom, just because it’s me that has to be the one accepting them, and not outside people, not society. And I think that’s why White privilege still exists. Because there’s just still people out there that think they’re better than others. So I just have to make sure, me, as a teacher, they all know that I think every single one of them can do, can be successful (second interview, 4/3/2008).

Susanna, who identified her ethnicity as Hispanic, told me that she didn't mark "yes" on many of the 26 questions, but had marked "yes" on "a couple." Susanna confessed that she had never thought about White privilege in American society before this discussion. Listening to one African American female student's perspective especially helped her realize the existence of white privilege. This new realization about white privilege made Susanna think about how she, as a teacher, should act in order to overcome White privilege in her classroom. For example, she could try to provide the same opportunities to every student, or accept that every student could be successful.

Although Susanna said that she came to recognize existing White privilege from the class discussion, she seemed to understand only part of the idea of White privilege. McIntosh's (1990) article emphasized how White privilege was perpetuated in American society and how difficult it was for non-White people to confront it. The article was clear that the problem of White privilege was social issue, which we need to combat continuously. However, Susanna appeared to think of White privilege as simply an individual matter.

(c) Influences related to issues of diversity and social justice. This subsection focuses on Susanna's learning related to diversity and social justice from the methods course.

Diversity in the classroom. Susanna identified her recognition of the diversity in her classroom as an important thing that she learned from methods class during the spring semester.

Jong-Hyun: What kinds of learning experiences were new ones to you from this spring semester's methods class?

Susanna: Um, definitely about diversity in the classroom. Um, and not even just race diversity, but bilingual and ESL children, and even special education students. I think that was probably the most important thing, looking at the different, diverse setting that could happen in the future.

Jong-Hyun: So, what do you think about how the learning about diversity in this semester will affect your teaching?

Susanna: Um, I definitely think it will affect me by forcing me to use different methods to teach. Like, because we focused on even songs to reach out to children, and website they can look at museums. Instead of just giving them a book and saying, "Here's the book, read the book," because some kids, they just don't learn that way. So definitely, because we did a whole those [learning] stations. You could go and look at the songs, and listen to the songs, and you could go and look at websites, and all that stuff. So I think definitely it would help me do that (second interview, 4/3/2008).

Talking about the topics of bilingual and ESL students during one class session during the spring semester helped Susanna realize that there was not only race-based diversity among students but also language-related diversity and special education students. Susanna connected this new realization with the necessity of using different instructional methods in her teaching. In particular, she credited one class session, in which groups of the students went to five different learning stations focused on music, an African-American artist, arts and culture websites in Japan, and firsthand experiences with how to use visual arts, songs, and websites for teaching social studies. Overall, Susanna argued that using different instructional methods was imperative because she would have diverse students in her classroom.

Regarding diversity as different cultures. Susanna solidified her concept of diversity while taking the methods class. In particular, she came to think of diversity as being related to different cultures, not solely race (second interview, 4/3/2008). More importantly, Susanna came to think that an important role of the teacher is to help students

become aware of other cultures and accept them. After reading Takaki's book, Susanna reflected:

Later the book [Takaki's book] explained how we should know about other cultures in order to understand them ourselves. I think that will be a major role for me as a teacher, to get my classroom and students to not only be aware of other cultures but also accepting and understanding of them (weekly response paper).

Susanna also expressed that she would focus on teaching different cultures in her social studies lessons later.

Jong-Hyun: When you teach social studies to elementary students, what aspect or issue would you focus on?

Susanna: I don't know, there're so many things I could think of. I think different cultures. That would be, like, my favorite thing to teach about. Different cultures, because then you can learn about their history. And because everyone here has come from a different culture, so then you can learn about where you came from, so it would work for any grade, even the little ones. Because then you tell them to go home and ask your mom and dad what country you came from, and then let's talk about those countries. And it could go week by week, you know, "This week we're going to talk about where Katie is from. She's from Denmark." So I think that would be cool (second interview, 4/3/2008).

Un-developed concept of social justice. While Susanna solidified her concept of diversity while taking the methods course, she didn't mention any particular learning related to issues of social justice.

Jong-Hyun: What is your perspective or idea about issue of social justice?

Susanna: Um, social justice...gosh, that one's hard. I don't know. Um, I have no clue. That one I don't know [laughing]. That one I don't know.

Jong-Hyun: Maybe you can think about how the subject of social studies can be related to issue of social justice, or making the society more just.

Susanna: Yeah. Okay. That...gosh, I don't know what I think of, though. I don't know what I think of. I don't think of it being racial, or anything like that.

Jong-Hyun: As educator, you maybe heard many times, many educators talk about social justice issue. So, what comes to your mind when you heard about many scholars or teachers talking about social justice?

Susanna: Um...

Jong-Hyun: For example, some people think about basically economic issue, or some people think about opportunity issue, or so...

Susanna: Right...yeah, I think I would think of economic issues more than other, especially because the class I'm in now, we have a couple of students who actually every Friday, they get a huge grocery bag of food. Of snacks, and can of soup, and stuff like that. And when I drive to school, I drive past the homeless shelter. So, I guess I think of that, and, it makes me feel sad. It's very sad (second interview, 4/3/2008).

It seemed that Susanna hadn't developed a concept of social justice while taking the methods course. After I mentioned economic issues, she mentioned only economic-related situations, including a homeless shelter and Friday grocery bags for the student in her class. I was curious why Susanna could only think about social justice issues in terms of economics, because I knew she had learned about social justice during the methods course. For example, her literature circle book, *Confronting racism, poverty, and power: Classroom strategies to change the world* by Compton-Lilly (2004) described a "critical literacy project" related to social justice issues, and it presented ways to change the students' communities, but she didn't connect this with the concept of social justice. Susanna also wrote up her plans for "building a democratic classroom community" as final assignment for the spring semester, but she didn't show any evidence that she understood that building a democratic community was an integral part of a socially just society.

In sum, when Susanna was asked how the methods course influenced her perspective on issues of diversity and social justice, Susanna stated:

The only way that I have really changed my views about diversity and social justice is that it needs to be stressed more in the classroom and more time needs to be spent on these topics in the classroom. I guess I just didn't see how important these issues were before (e-mail communication, 8/11/2008).

Section 3: Analyzing student teaching practices. This section focuses on analyzing Susanna's student teaching practices related to her learning from the methods course. Information about her class contexts and her cooperating teacher, and overall information about what she taught as social studies lessons will be provided first, followed by the analysis of her student teaching practices.

Class contexts and cooperating teacher, Mrs. Ross. Susanna's full time student teaching placement during the spring semester was a fifth-grade gifted classroom in an elementary school in an urban area. Although the student demographic of the whole school was predominately African-American, her class was very diverse in terms of ethnicity. Among the 20 students, 6 were Caucasian, 2 were African-American, 2 were Russian, 1 was Polish, 1 was Danish, and 8 were Asian, including 4 Chinese students. This class was very diverse because most students' parents were either students or professors at the university who had come from other countries (interview with Susanna's cooperating teacher, 5/29/2008). This school offered the gifted class in order to attract parents from diverse ethnicities. This class was also unique in terms of gender ratio: there were 15 boys, but only five girls. Language arts, math, and science were emphasized in the class's daily schedule, which made it difficult for Susanna to find time for social studies lessons.

Susanna's cooperating teacher, Mrs. Ross, had taught for three years in the Chicago suburbs directly after college. She moved to this area with her husband when he began studying at the university, and she took a fifteen-year break from teaching to take care of

her young children. Eight years ago, she resumed teaching and was given a position in the gifted classroom, where she has been teaching ever since. Mrs. Ross said that she had wanted to be a teacher since she had entered school at age four, and she had never changed her mind about that. The only thing that had changed was the grade level she wanted to teach. Until her student teaching, she wanted to teach first and second grades, but after student teaching she changed her preference to upper grade levels. Mrs. Ross said that she thought the most important role of an elementary teacher is to provide a safe environment that challenges students to think independently (interview with Susanna's cooperating teacher, 5/29/2008).

Mrs. Ross had had student teachers for seven consecutive years, because she regarded having student teachers as her way of giving back to the profession. She particularly mentioned that, because she thinks she is a good teacher, she wanted to give student teachers the opportunity to learn from her. Her main goal was to give her student teachers as many experiences and as much autonomy as possible, so that the student teachers would be ready for their own classrooms (interview with Susanna's cooperating teacher, 5/29/2008).

Overall information about what Susanna taught as social studies lessons. Unlike the other two participants, Susanna didn't have a chance to teach any social studies lessons before she started her full time student teaching. During her student teaching, Susanna taught two chapters from the social studies textbook: Chapter 15, "Moving West," which focused on how thousands of Americans moved west between 1820 and 1860, and the other was Chapter 16, "A House Divided," which focused on the history of the Civil War.

Besides teaching these two chapters, with the approval of her cooperating teacher, Mrs. Ross, Susanna was also able to teach the mini-unit “American Ethnic and Racial Diversity.” I observed most of her lessons when she taught these two chapters the mini unit.

Susanna’s student teaching practices are organized in two subsections: (a) her teaching practices related to her learning from the methods class, and (b) her teaching practices related to diversity and social justice. The data sources for this analysis are mainly my field notes from observing her teaching, the second and the third interviews, her lesson plans, and e-mail communications.

(a) Susanna’s teaching practices related to her learning from the methods course.

This subsection analyzes how Susanna tried to incorporate her learning from the methods course into her student teaching practices. Her teaching practices directly related to diversity and social justice will be discussed in the next subsection.

One major concern that Susanna had while she was teaching the two chapters from the social studies textbook was changing the method that her cooperating teacher employed for social studies. What Susanna saw was that for social studies, her cooperating teacher merely gave out the test package that came with the textbook to the students at the beginning of the week and had the students answer the questions in the package by the end of the week as homework. There was no class time to talk about the textbook, and no test about it. Her cooperating teacher, Mrs. Ross, told me that although she did not like doing this, the reason why she was doing this was that she didn’t want to use class time to read a textbook, because she was required by the district to present the information in the textbook. Instead, the cooperating teacher said she did interactive units such as a play on the

Revolutionary War and a simulation about coming to the New World, which she thought more valuable than the text or time consuming projects (interview with Susanna's cooperating teacher, 5/29/2008).

Susanna didn't object to the play or simulations that the students did as interactive units, but she objected to the fact that there was never class time to talk about the textbook. For example, when the students did the play on the Revolutionary War, they were given only the script for the play with no class time to discuss the Revolutionary War. Susanna thought that merely giving a test package to the students and having them answer questions didn't help the students learn, since she thought that the students were just copying the answers from the textbook. Indeed, she was disappointed about it and wanted to teach her two chapters differently.

Susanna: I just wanted the kids to stop reading a packet and answering questions. I just wanted to give them something different, because that's what she had them doing. All they did was read a packet, and then you answer questions.

Jong-Hyun: So when you tried to change the method your cooperating teacher employed, what was your main goal or what was your main reason?

Susanna: Because I don't think they're learning anything. They were copying straight from the book. All it was, she handed it out at the beginning of the week, and they had a week to finish it. And you don't learn anything like that. You're copying it right out of the text. You're just writing it down. I really don't think they were learning anything.

Jong-Hyun: Since you thought that her method is not learning, you wanted to change. So, what did you change the strategy or the method when you taught social studies?

Susanna: Um, obviously, we discussed about it, so a lot of kids were answering, you know, questions out loud, and a lot of opinion questions, which I thought was really important. Also, like the group thing, where they teach other kids, I thought that was

a really fun strategy. I just try to change it up a little bit, just try a couple things out (third interview, 5/15/2008).

In the following paragraphs, Susanna's attempt to use different methods from those of her cooperating teacher to teach the social studies textbook, and her use of things that she had learned from the methods course will be analyzed.

Employing jigsaw teaching. In an attempt to improve upon her cooperating teacher's methods, one strategy that Susanna employed was the jigsaw teaching method, using four groups of students. Each group of five students was assigned to read a certain part of a chapter and asked to take notes about the main ideas. Then, each group sent one student to each of the other three tables, so that there was at least one expert on each part at each table. The expert students took turns teaching the other students about their parts (fieldnotes, 4/10/2008).

When Susanna used this method the first time, she encountered two problems. First, she realized that the students didn't know how to take notes, and that the reading assignment had been too long for the students' ability. In order to resolve these problems, on another day, Susanna taught the students how to take notes. Then, when she used this method a second time, she shortened the assigned reading, so the students had no difficulties in taking notes on the main ideas of their assigned parts (fieldnotes, 4/22/2008).

Susanna said that she adopted this jigsaw method from the methods class when they had read Takaki's book. Occasionally, as weekly assignments during the fall semester, the students were asked to read only one of a two- to three-chapter section of Takaki's book. Then during class the students who had read the same chapter had a quick group discussion about it, and later they were asked to present the main points of their chapter to their

classmates. Susanna also indicated that she had employed a similar method in assigning science project to the students. She mentioned that some of the students liked her jigsaw method, since it is interactive and fun.

Jong-Hyun: Did you use some strategy or some learning from social studies methods class?

Susanna: Um... like the group thing, where they teach other kids, I thought that was a really fun strategy. Um, in science, we also did something that reminded me of the methods class, where I had them pair up, and then I gave them each a different topic of the plant part, so like, roots or stems or leaves, or something like that, and then they had to present it to the class. So it was very different for them, and I think that definitely came from there.

Jong-Hyun: So, what was the students' reaction when you used the jigsaw method?

Susanna: Some of them loved it, and some of them, you know, because I asked them as we were doing it, "Would you prefer to do this, or would you prefer for me to just give you that packet, and you have a week?" Some of them would say, "I wish we just had the packet," because they don't want to work. They don't want to think about it. Um, and some of them would say, "I like doing this better," because it's more interactive, they have fun (third interview, 5/15/2008).

Having whole class discussion during the Civil War lessons. As another approach different from her cooperating teacher's method, Susanna employed whole class discussion when she taught Chapter 16, "A House Divided—Civil War," which consisted of four lessons. The students did a jigsaw for lesson one, but then Susanna had whole class discussion about each of the other three lessons. This was done either after the students read the textbook themselves or while the whole class was reading it together. Although the analysis of my observation of these discussions showed that Susanna usually talked about the important points of each lesson, two things are significant about how her learning from the methods class seemed to affect her teaching.

First, it appeared that Susanna tried to focus on reasoning instead of simply memorizing facts when she employed whole class discussion about the Civil War. She initiated “why” questions many times during the discussion. For example, she asked such questions as, “Why was the book [*Uncle Tom’s Cabin*] banned in the South?”, “Why did Lincoln, as a president, not do anything? Why didn’t he call up troops to start a war?”, “Why was this battle, Gettysburg, important?”, and “Why did Douglass think the African Americans should join the war?” By initiating such “why” questions, Susanna was able to meet her objective for the lesson.

Jong-Hyun: Although you need to touch the content of the textbook, what was your objective when you taught the civil war lesson?

Susanna: I wanted to give them not even just what happened in the Civil War, but like what the reason for it was. Why the Civil War happened, and what came out of it.

Jong-Hyun: How did you feel about how this lesson went? And what did you think the students learned?

Susanna: I think it had its ups and downs. Um, I don’t think it went great, absolutely fantastic, but I think it was pretty successful in that most of the kids were able to understand why the things happened, instead of just memorizing dates. I didn’t want them to just sit there and memorize dates. Of course they should know the approximate years it happened, but I’m not going to sit there and say, you know, “When was the Battle of Bull Run, and how many people died?” No, that is not the point. The point is to talk about why it happened, and how it happened, and what was the cause of the war. What did they learn? Um, I think most of them learned, like the reasoning, more than anything, than just the facts (third interview, 5/15/2008).

Susanna’s prioritization of reasoning over memorizing facts in teaching about the Civil War can be attributed to the social studies methods class, through which she changed her previous concept that social studies was simply “fact memorization.” One of the

conceptual frameworks for the methods class was the use of inquiry, and this may have influenced her focus on reasoning, but she didn't clearly express this.

On the other hand, Susanna didn't demonstrate any use of the concept of Essential Questions and Enduring Understanding that the methods class introduced. The textbook provided the theme of "Conflict and Resolution" for the Civil War chapter, so Susanna could have utilized this theme to develop Essential Questions and Enduring Understandings. Susanna did not bring up essential questions such as "Why does conflict exist in human society?" or "How have people tried to resolve conflict?" Thus, it might be said that the concept of Essential Questions and Enduring Understanding did not influence her teaching.

Second, Susanna paid special attention to teaching what she considered to be accurate accounts about Lincoln related to both the Civil War and the freeing of slaves.

Susanna asked the students to turn in their social studies textbooks to page 432. Then she said, "This Lesson 2 talks about beginning of the war. We watched a movie yesterday about Bull Run. Bull Run was the first battle of the Civil War." Then Susanna initiated the class discussion by asking, "Why did Lincoln, as a president, not do anything? Why didn't he call up troops to start a war?" One white boy answered, "Because he was afraid that they were not ready yet. He didn't want to start a war. So..." Susanna immediately responded, "O.K. that's great. That's a great answer. Why didn't he want to start the war?" He answered, "Because he thought that everybody should be equal, and slaves were free..." Susanna responded to him, "Slaves were not free yet." He said, "I know, but he thought they should be." Then, Susanna told the whole class. "O.K, well, here is something about Lincoln that I want you remember. He was opposed to slavery, but he didn't necessarily think that slaves should be free. That's what is strange about Lincoln's situation. Lincoln didn't think the nation was ready to have freed slaves. So, he did oppose slavery, but he wanted to make sure whether or not it was a good idea to actually go through with freeing the slaves--that's the Emancipation Proclamation that we'll talk about today." ... Later, Susanna asked the students to move to Lesson 3, page 444. Then she said, "African-Americans had a little different view about what the war was about than Lincoln. What did African Americans think the war was about?" One African American girl answered, "They thought the war was

about slavery..." Susanna responded, "Yes, they thought the war was about slavery. So, they were thinking this was so great. 'The country is fighting over us. We want to be free.' They wanted to join the North. But, what's Lincoln thinking this war about? What's his sole purpose actually involving this war?" One white boy answered, "He wanted to save the Union..." Susanna responded, "To save the Union, exactly. He wanted to get this war over, so that there could be one Union, one nation. In contrast, African Americans were thinking all about slavery." Susanna continued to talk about Frederick Douglass, who argued that African Americans should be allowed to join the war. After this, Susanna said, "Now, we are moving to the Emancipation Proclamation. They were thinking about freeing slaves. Lots of people were suggesting to give slaves freedom. But, Lincoln was very hesitant about this. Why was Lincoln so hesitant?" An Asian boy answered, "He was afraid to lose four states—Missouri, Kentucky, Maryland, and Delaware." Susanna said, "Right. Remember if Lincoln decided to pass something that freed the slaves, they might lose four states' support because they allowed slavery in those states. But, what did Lincoln know later?" Another Asian boy answered, "Lincoln knew enslaved African American were being forced to help the South." Also, a white boy answered, "He knew England would not support the South if the North took a stand against slavery." Susanna asked, "Finally, what did Lincoln decide?" An African-American girl answered, "freedom for slaves." Susanna asked, "What did Lincoln do?" An Asian girl answered, "Emancipation Proclamation..." Susanna asked, "What day did that happen?" A white boy answered, "January, 1, 1863" (fieldnotes, 5/1/2008).

The vignette above shows how Susanna tried to get the students to understand what she considered to be real accounts about Lincoln, freeing the slaves, and the Civil War. She especially focused on Lincoln's position on freeing the slaves and the reason why he joined the war. Susanna tried to get the students to understand the intentions of Abraham Lincoln during the Civil War period, rather than just memorizing dates and facts. She emphasized what she considered to be "real information" about Lincoln, because she realized that most of the students had incorrect knowledge about this period.

Susanna: I thought it was really interesting that a lot of people thought that Abraham Lincoln just wanted to end slavery. That's what the kids thought, from the beginning, that he wanted to end slavery, and he was anti-slavery and all that stuff. But his real reason for joining the war, or not, right away, was because he just wanted the whole

union to be together. So I thought that was a really, really big part of it. So I wanted them to learn about the real story (third interview, 5/15/08)

It seemed that her learning from studying different historical accounts of Christopher Columbus influenced her decision to focus on what the students should know about the story of Lincoln, because she realized that the students had incorrect ideas about Lincoln related to slaves and the Civil War. Realizing that the things they learn in elementary school can last throughout the students' lives, Susanna didn't want the students to learn incorrect facts about Lincoln. However, this goal also shows that Susanna didn't view history as interpretative, but rather as having one truth. Therefore, she didn't provide her students the opportunity to compare different historical accounts about Lincoln's story using trade books, as the methods course had demonstrated. In short, she didn't lead her students to see history as interpretative or narrative, or to understand that history has multiple perspectives.

The reactions of Susanna's students and cooperating teacher to her teaching of social studies. During the third interview with Susanna, which I conducted after she had finished her student teaching practicum, we talked about how the students and her cooperating teacher reacted to her approach being different than that of her cooperating teacher for the social studies lessons.

Jong-Hyun: I wonder how the students felt about your different approach in social studies lessons?

Susanna: Um, I would say, like 70-80 percent of them... definitely more than half of them liked doing it better. There were only a select few that didn't like it. That wished they just had the packet.

Jong-Hyun: Did you ask about why they didn't like?

Susanna: Um, I didn't. I think I asked one of the kids, and he said, "Because then you have to take a test," and he didn't want to take the test. So, that might be some of the reason.

Jong-Hyun: How did you feel about your approach, different way of teaching the social studies?

Susanna: Um, I think, for the most part...the kids got way, way more out of it, just because we were able to discuss it. Just, even as simple as discussing it. Just talking about it is a way more beneficial for them than giving a packet. And looking for key phrases in the book, which they probably didn't even read. So I think almost all of them benefited from it, totally.

Jong-Hyun: I also wonder what was your cooperating teacher's reaction or feedback when you tried to employ this method?

Susanna: I think she really liked it. I mean, she kind of told me, "I'm not very strong in social studies, so I don't really feel that comfortable talking about it." Also that she never could find time to fit it in, so that's why it's, like, a side thing for them. But once I started doing it, she really liked it. Um, and I kind of told her what was going on, and how people that never talked in class were raising their hand to give their opinion and stuff, and she loved it.

Jong-Hyun: When you say "some students who never talked were raisin their hands to give their opinion," who are they?

Susanna: Um, like Jacob. He never raised his hand during the language arts class, and during math. Nothing. Steve was another one that raised his hand a lot. He very rarely talked during language arts and math. And, he talked a lot in science, too. But he talked a ton in social studies. And Sandra—one of the girls—she actually gave a lot of input to our discussion. So those students were kind of exceptional students who participated in the social studies discussion (third interview, 5/15/2008).

Susanna stated that both her cooperating teacher and at least half of the students liked her teaching methods. Susanna also evaluated that the students learned better because they discussed the textbook, instead of merely individually reading the textbook and answering the questions, as her cooperating teacher had had the students do. The fact that some students who never talked in other classes actively participated in discussion during Susanna's social studies lessons can be regarded as

a significant result of her approach. Overall, it seemed that Susanna was successful in getting the students interested in the subject of social studies.

(b) Susanna's teaching practices related to diversity and social justice. This subsection focuses on analyzing Susanna's teaching related to diversity and social justice.

Mini unit "American Ethnic and Racial Diversity: Challenges and Contributions."

Realizing the importance of social studies as a school subject, Susanna expressed her desire to spend more time on social studies (second interview, 4/3/2008). The mini unit "American Ethnic and Racial Diversity" can be regarded as a realization of that desire.

Jong-Hyun: What was the title of the mini-unit?

Susanna: Civil Rights. And it wasn't—I mean, I wish we would have been able to correspond it with the actual historical movement that happened stuff like. But, it was more for an experience for them about civil rights. So I mean, we didn't really cover the historical topic about it very well.

Jong-Hyun: Where did you get the idea of the mini-unit?

Susanna: Well, it was right before my full takeover, and I had a lot of space to fill, and not only did I want to do the social studies, but she had them doing a lot of language arts things in the morning that I didn't think they needed that much time, so I had a lot of space to fill. And she just brought it to me, it [Civil Rights Movements Teacher Handbook] was like this whole prepared unit, but it goes on even past the civil rights, and she said, "Just if you're interested, just look it over, you could maybe just do the first lesson, which is civil rights." So, I looked at it, and I thought it was really cool and worth our time, so, and I think that it totally was worth our time (third interview, 5/15/2008).

Although her cooperating teacher, Mrs. Ross, showed the teacher handbook to Susanna as a reference, it was Susanna's own decision to do this mini unit during her full-time student teaching period. In fact, since the unit didn't have any topics that corresponded directly with the fifth grade social studies textbook, she had no obligation to use it. Both her desire to spend more time on social studies and her interest in teaching about diversity in

U.S. society appeared to contribute to her decision. The mini-unit also showed how her learning from the methods course was incorporated into her student teaching.

In teaching this mini-unit, Susanna basically adopted an introductory activity from the teacher handbook titled “*The Civil Rights Movement: Twentieth Century United States History*” (1999). The main objective of this activity was to provide an opportunity for the students to learn historical information about various American ethnic and racial groups, before actually studying the Civil Rights Movement. Although the handbook provided the top sixteen groups by number in the U.S. according to the 1990 U.S census, Susanna randomly selected 10 groups because she had 20 students. Thus she could assign each of the ten ethnic/racial groups to a pair of students, and they could learn about the group’s immigration settlement patterns, obstacles and challenges after immigration, and their contributions to American society. Then, each pair was asked to present the information to the other students. Thus, although Susanna used “Civil Rights,” in the title of this mini-unit, it was not actually about the Civil Rights Movement. Rather, it was a study of information about various American ethnic and racial groups. As I understand, Susanna used “Civil Rights” in the name of this lesson simply because she adopted the handbook title. However, based on the actual content of the mini-unit, I changed its title to “American Ethnic and Racial Diversity: Challenges and Contributions.”

Susanna spent four days over the course of two weeks on this mini-unit. In order to give a more detailed description of how Susanna taught this mini-unit, four vignettes are provided below, one from each day.

First day of the mini-unit: “Pre-assessment—fairness spectrum”

Susanna said, “We will talk about something called ‘civil rights.’ Does anyone know what ‘civil rights’ means?” One white boy said, “Everybody can have same rights no matter what their ethnicities are. Normally, in America, something about what Martin Luther King did.” Two other students also talked about the Civil Rights Movement and Martin Luther King’s speech. Susanna responded, “Yes, your answers are all good ideas,” and had the students take out a blank piece of paper. Using the overhead, Susanna showed what the students needed to draw on their papers. Writing the title, “U.S. society today,” she drew big straight line on the paper. She wrote at the right end of the line, “All people treated fairly,” and at the left end, “All people treated unfairly.” Then she asked, “Where do you think our U.S. society today is? Everyone gets treated equal, every single person gets treated equal? Or you think everyone gets treated unfairly, unequally? So you’re gonna put circle where you think our society is, and write a couple sentences telling why.” One Asian boy asked, “From our class?” Susanna said, “No. Our society. You know what ‘society’ means? Can someone tell what ‘society’ means?” Another Asian boy said, “Think about a big neighborhood.” Susanna said, “That’s a good way of explanation. Think about the people of our big neighborhood or our nation.” Susanna continued, “Think about your reason. If you think certain people or certain groups are not treated fairly, write your reasons.” The students worked on this task for about three minutes. Later, Susanna asked several students to tell where they had located their circles and what they had written. One African-American girl, Sharon, said that she marked a little bit to the right (fair side) of the middle of the line, and she wrote, “Because some people get treated differently because of the color of their skin or where they come from.” One white boy, Jacob, said that he put his circle very close to the “unfair” end of the line, and he wrote, “Because people have to pay more money to do fun stuff. Plus prices are so high for gas.” Another white boy said that he put his circle very close to the “unfair” end of the line, and he wrote, “Because you are poor, you really don’t have any rights. Because now food price goes so higher, it’s hard for buying anything with one-dollar bill. And it still has so much racism very much all over.” Susanna responded, “That’s a good explanation,” and asked, “After we talked about this, how many people want to change their mind?” Some of the students raised their hands (fieldnotes, 4/16/2008).

On the first day of this mini unit, Susanna had a pre-assessment of how fair the students considered American society to be. Since some students didn’t even know what “society” meant, the class had to talk a little about what a society is. The students were asked to put a circle on the fairness spectrum where they thought U.S. society was then.

When Susanna asked the students to present their opinions, two students—one African-American girl, Sharon, and one white boy—mentioned reasons related to racial issues. However, one white boy, Jacob, simply blamed the economy, which Susanna thought very strange (third interview, 5/15/2008). Susanna collected their papers and kept them to compare with the post-assessment later.

Second day of the mini-unit: “Learn about one ethnic group as pairs”
Saying, “This is an example of Mexican American ethnicity,” Susanna showed an example of a quilt-square paper titled, “Mexican-American contributions,” with three pictures: a cowboy, food, and architecture. Susanna said, “So, every single group has a different ethnicity from your ethnicity. You don’t have to draw where the people came from, but I like to have some representation of that ethnicity. Also something they contributed to the United States, advantages we have because of them. So, for Mexicans, that was architecture. And really, authentic cowboys came from Mexico. It was inspired by Mexicans.” Then, Susanna asked, “Might that be an advantage or disadvantage for Mexican-Americans?” One white boy, Steve said, “I think it might be a disadvantage because Hollywood movies describes them using guns, so people think they are violent. Also, it might be a disadvantage because different groups of people thought of racism something like that.” Susanna said, “So, it’s kind of racist by the cowboy idea. What else? I’m looking for a different word. I’m thinking of different ways.” Another white boy said, “I think it is a disadvantage because, as Steve said, cowboys are portrayed as violent.” Responding their answers, Susanna said, “O.K, I am thinking of a kind of term. Do you know what I am thinking here? I am thinking of the word ‘stereotype.’ Have you heard of that word?” Some students said, “Yeah...” Susanna asked, “What is a stereotype?” One Asian boy said, “It’s like what people believe about a group of people.” Susanna responded, “Yes, exactly. So, Steve and Peter gave examples of what a cowboy is believed to be like. They are violent people, they all wear cowboy hats, they all wear jeans, ride horses, lots of cattle, so that might be a disadvantage because now obviously people have the stereotype that they’re cowboys and that they are violent.” Then, Susanna asked the students to draw at least three advantages and three disadvantages on their quilt-square papers about their assigned ethnicity group (fieldnotes, 4/18/2008).

As the main activity on the second day of this mini-unit, each of the ten pairs of students studied historical information about each of the ten ethnic groups and made their

quilt-square papers portraying three challenges and three contributions to American society for each group. When Susanna distributed the ethnicity group information handouts, she made sure that no one was studying their own race or ethnicity. This was her strategy for making the students learn more about other ethnicities than their own (third interview, 5/15/2008). One significant event on this day was that, as the vignette above implies, the opportunity arose to talk about the word “stereotype,” which was not included in her initial plans for teaching this mini-unit (third interview, 5/15/2008). However, Susanna tried to touch on the problem of believing stereotypes, and also pointed out the problem again on the last day of this mini-unit.

Third day of the mini-unit: “Learn about other ethnicity groups”

Students got together with their partners and worked on decorating their quilt-square papers. I [Jong-Hyun] asked one group of 2 white boys working at a back left table, whose topic was Chinese-Americans, “What were some disadvantages for Chinese-Americans?” They answered, “They couldn’t marry White people, they were segregated because of racism, and were treated like slaves. So Chinese Americans were treated differently from others.” I asked, “If you went to China and were treated like slaves, how do you feel?” One white boy answered, “I’d feel very bad.” Later, as the students finished decorating their quilt-square papers, Susanna said, “We will look at each other’s quilt-square papers. You have different information from each other about different ethnicities in the USA. You will need to talk about advantages and disadvantages of each ethnicity. For presenting, one of you will hold the paper and the other will look around at others’ papers. Then later, switch. Let’s start!” While ten students, one from each of the ten pairs, held up their quilt-square papers around the classroom, the other ten students began looking at the papers from the other groups. Susanna and I [Jong-Hyun] went to the Irish-American corner. The white boy holding the paper told us, “The Irish were treated like slaves and had stereotypes such as drinking and inferior.” Then, I went to the Chinese-American corner, and a white boy told me, “The disadvantages of Chinese-American were that they couldn’t marry White people and were treated like slaves. In short, they were treated unfairly in those days, but are treated fairly now.” Susanna and I also went to the Arab-American corner. The Asian boy there told us that nowadays Arab-American are treated unfairly and are stereotyped as terrorists. I went to the Italian-American corner, and an Asian boy told me, “The

advantage of Italian-Americans was bringing food such as pizza, but disadvantages were that they were treated like slaves and were thought to be inferior. Nowadays, they are treated fairly.” Susanna clapped as a signal and said, “You don’t have to rush. We’ll continue later next week” (fieldnotes, 4/25/2008).

On the third day of this mini-unit, after finishing the quilt-square papers, the students had the opportunity to learn historical information about other ethnicity groups. While one student from each of the ten pairs held up their quilts around the classroom, the other students went to each ethnic group corner to learn about the other nine ethnic groups’ challenges and contributions to American society. Later the students switched roles. As they made their way around the room, the students were required to fill out worksheets about what they’d learned from listening to the other groups’ presentations.

Fourth day of the mini-unit: “Post-assessment: fairness spectrum”

The students continued their activity from the previous day of the unit, looking around at other groups’ quilts. I [Jong-Hyun] went to the African-American corner, and the white girl there told me, “Once they were slaves so unfairly, but now it’s O.K, they are treated fairly.” Later, I went to the Native American corner, and the white boy told me, “They were treated badly, mistreated. I learned this information for the first time.” Later, after all of the students had finished looking at the other groups’ quilt-square papers, Susanna had a discussion with the students.

She asked, “What are some of most surprising contributions made by each ethnicity?” One white boy answered, “Arab Americans started Kinko’s.” Susanna responded, “That one surprised me I think the most. That Arab Americans brought, they established Kinko’s. What else?” Another white boy said, “From Irish Americans, Irish music.” Also, an Asian boy said, “Potato chips came from the Irish.” Then, Susanna asked, “What are some of the most surprising obstacles and challenges that each group faced that you thought surprising?” An Asian boy answered, “I was surprised that Chinese Americans couldn’t marry White people.” Susanna responded, “Yeah, that was weird.” Another Asian boy answered, “I was surprised that Native Americans had committed suicide and homicide, and alcohol abuse. I thought they were very peaceful.” One white boy said, “I was surprised that Arab Americans raised certain terrorists.” Responding to this, one white boy said, “That’s a stereotype if you think all Arab Americans are terrorists.” Susanna said, “O.K. that’s stereotype. What’s a stereotype?” An Asian boy answered, “It’s like what a group of people are thought to be like.” Susanna said, “O.K. When I make a stereotype about a group of people, I generalize about the entire group of people.

For example, if I say, all people of Arabic descent are terrorists, that is stereotype. Do you think that's true?" The students said, "No!" Susanna said, "So, lots of disadvantages you've named are stereotypes, like the Italian mob." Later, Susanna had the students take out a blank piece of paper, and said, "Do you remember what we did the first day, when you put a circle on the line where you thought people are treated fairly? So, we'll do the same thing now, after we did all of this. Think about the things that you learned. Not just things about a certain ethnicity. Not just African American only, not Chinese-American only. Think about all ethnicities. Put a circle on which spot you think now, and write the reasons. Also if you remember where you put your circle first, write whether your opinion changed or not" (fieldnotes, 4/29/2008).

On the last day of this mini-unit, after the students finished looking around at the other ethnic groups, Susanna had a small discussion with the students in which she once again took advantage of the opportunity to teaching about the problem of believing in stereotypes and clearly identified a certain group's disadvantage if people believe in negative stereotypes, as in the case of Arab Americans. Finally, Susanna did a post-assessment with the fairness spectrum, asking whether their opinions had changed or not.

Susanna felt it was a disadvantage that she was not able to do this unit over four consecutive days. She was required to teach language arts, math, and science every day, so she had to take advantage of spare time to do this mini-unit. Indeed, the first day of this mini-unit was April 16th, but its last day was April 29th, almost two weeks later. Susanna believed, this caused the problem of students forgetting where they had located their circles on the fairness spectrum the first day when she asked them about it again on the last day (third interview, 5/15/2008).

As a researcher, I was very curious to see how much the students' opinions had changed in their post-assessments. Analysis of the pre- and post-assessments showed that while many students moved their circles closer to the unfair side in their post-assessment,

not all of them did. Those who did mentioned the problems of stereotyping or the unfair treatment of immigrants nowadays. However, a few students moved their marks closer to the fair end of the spectrum, but also stated the problem that certain groups were treated unfairly. For example, Jacob, a white boy, who blamed economic issues the first day, wrote in the post-assessment, “I moved from unfair side to fair side. My reason is that most Americans are treated fairly, but some Americans like Arab Americans are stereotyped like terrorist attack” (fieldnotes, 4/29/2008).

During the third interview with Susanna, which I conducted after her student teaching practicum, I was able to converse with her more about both her objectives and her reflection regarding this mini-unit. Susanna said that her original plan for this mini unit was to teach her students about the diversity and inequality that exist in American society, but she thought that the students had learned a lot more than she had planned.

Susanna: I originally planned to have them see the diversity and inequality that exist in our society. Um, and I think they learned a lot more than that, um, because we talked about stereotypes, and because we talked about the advantages, as well as disadvantages of the cultures that we get to zone in on. Um, it was kind of cool, because they learned both the positive parts, not just the negatives about that culture (third interview, 5/15/2008).

Susanna thought that this mini-unit had provided the opportunities beyond her original plan for the students to learn about the problem of negative stereotypes. Susanna also thought that this mini-unit helped the students change their opinions about whether people are treated fairly or unfairly in U.S. society.

Susanna: It [the post-assessment] showed that they learned something, because, obviously, something that we talked about made them switch what they were thinking in their head. And one of the kids actually, when we first did it, he said that he blames, he said that we’re treated unfairly, that U.S. society is treated unfairly,

because gas prices are going high. So he basically blamed it on the economy. And it was interesting to see his opinion change.... Because the exercise definitely gave them insight into more than just what we see now, into what has happened before. So, yeah, I thought it was really good (third interview, 5/15/2008).

When Susanna was asked what she wants to change if she does this mini-unit again, she stated that she wanted to talk more about the problem of negative stereotyping, since she felt that the class didn't have enough time to discuss it.

Susanna: I wish we could have spent more time talking about stereotypes, and maybe making a list of stereotypes that they see in school even, so that they can relate to it a little bit better. And because that class is so diverse, maybe talk about the stereotypes that they see in their own culture and stuff. Um, I mean, maybe just a little bit more time to discuss, that type of stuff (third interview, 5/15/2008).

Susanna clearly identified that the methods course in the fall semester, especially talking about inequalities in U.S. society and learning about different cultures, had helped her with this unit.

Jong-Hyun: For preparing this mini-unit did you use any learning from social studies methods class?

Susanna: Um, I actually, from, when the first semester, when we talked about all those cultures and everything, and how they were treated, it really did remind me of some things that Ana [her instructor] brought to our attention. So, I mean, while I was doing it, I really did think a lot about the things we talked about, even with Ana, the first semester. Because we did talk about some inequalities and stuff like that, in different cultures, in the United States that we should learn about, and even just around the world. So, I mean, I didn't use specific things from the class, but I definitely—it was definitely in the back of my mind the entire time. I kept thinking, "I have to tell her that I did this, because she's going to be so happy, and it's a cool lesson" (third interview, 5/15/2008).

Susanna pointed out several particular things, including the reading the Takaki book, the guest from Asian studies who showed them the Chinese scroll art, and her instructor's presentation about how she had done a celebration with her class about "El Dia de Los Muertos" (Day of the Dead), had opened her eyes to different cultures and led her

interested in sharing different cultures with her own class (e-mail communication, 9/19/2008).

How Susanna considered the unique demographic of her class for addressing the issues of diversity and social justice. As stated earlier, the demographic of Susanna's full-time student teaching class was unique compared to most classes. The students' background cultures were very diverse, and also the ratio of boy to girls was 15 to five. Thus, I anticipated that Susanna could spend more time addressing issues of diversity and social justice by taking advantage of this unique demographic. However, during my observations of her teaching, I didn't see any particular occasions in which Susanna explicitly addressed those issues, except the mini-unit "American Ethnic and Racial Diversity."

During the third interview with Susanna, I had a long conversation with her about this matter. I especially focused on asking if she had considered the unique class demographic in order to address the issues of diversity and social justice.

Jong-Hyun: When you say, "Except the mini-unit, you didn't much address the issue of diversity or social justice," what was the reason or difficulty not much addressed?

Susanna: Um, I didn't address it just because I kind of just did what she told me I needed to do. I mean, I would really like to, in my prime classroom, I would love to every month, study a different culture, and then do maybe an international day, or something like that. But, I just kind of basically, I mean, she told me what needed to get done, and that's kind of difficult...

Jong-Hyun: But in your class, was there some possible way to address issue of diversity or social justice issue? Because in your class it was so diverse. Also, on the other hand, usually other classroom is half boys, and half girls. Your class, had only five girls. So considering those situation, demographics in your classroom, had you thought about addressing issue of diversity or social justice?

Susanna: Um, yeah. I mean, if there was a bigger problem with, for example, like Jacob making all these Asian derogatory statements, I definite—like there would be with no hesitation, we would have talked about stereotypes, and, you know, how does that hurt someone, and we would have definitely addressed it. But they all got along in that respect, like, they never had any confrontation about where someone was from, or if they were black or white, or if they were Asian, or anything. Or Russian. They didn't have any problems there. But if it would have been an issue, I definitely, without hesitation, would have addressed it somehow. I'm not really sure how, but we would have definitely talked about it.

Jong-Hyun: So what is your basic thoughts about having only five girls in your classroom? You thought about the situation, helping them? Had you thought about the situation of five girl students?

Susanna: I mean, we did a couple things, like, if you noticed, like the last arrangement, we had them all together. So, we try not to split them up too much. If we do the literature circles, sometimes we'll have two girls in a group, and two girls in a group, and then one girl will be out by herself. She [Susanna's cooperating teacher] tries not to do that, thus so one girl doesn't feel singled out, because it's not fair to her. You know, I mean, there's only five of them, so, how come the other two get to be with a partner, but she doesn't? So she tries not to do that. So, the last literature group, we had a group just of girls. Um, so she kind of addresses it that way. There was one day when the girls were being really good. They were getting to work, they weren't talking, like they usually just have side conversations and write notes to each other and stuff. And they weren't doing that, and they all lined up for specials, and the girls were the only ones not talking. And I made a comment, and I said, "Wow. There's only five girls, and they are so on task, and staying focused," and all of that, and I made a comment, and I said, "Boys, you better step it up, because right now, there are five girls that are beating you." And they're going to sign the Respect Board. And so, I'll try and do stuff like that, so that they feel like they have more power in the classroom than just being five (third interview, 5/15/2008).

Susanna identified her position as student teacher, being obligated to follow her cooperating teacher's directions, as a big obstacle to addressing the issues of diversity and social justice more during her student teaching. In another passage during the third interview, Susanna expressed that she would definitely teach the mini-unit on Civil Rights

and focus on teaching different cultures as topics of diversity and social justice when she had her own classroom later (third interview, 5/15/2008).

Regarding whether Susanna considered the unique demographic of her class in order to address the issues of diversity and social justice, she gave two different answers. She didn't take advantage of the ethnic diversity in her classroom to address the topic of diversity, because she thought that there was no particular problem among the students requiring her to address diversity issues. In contrast, Susanna was concerned about the unfairness of having only five girls in the class. She tried to make sure the five girls did not feel marginalized by being the minority. I assume the attitude of her cooperating teacher, who didn't want to group students so that there was only one girl in a group of five, was a big factor behind Susanna's concern.

Case 2: Julie

Section 1: Julie's family and educational background. Julie grew up in a west suburb of Chicago, which was not a diverse community. Both of her parents were of German descent, their ancestors having immigrated to the U.S. in the late 1800s. Julie had two brothers and two sisters, and was the fourth child. She identified her family as lower-middle income working class since her dad worked as an accountant and her mom did simple secretarial work. Also, Julie expressed that because living in a one-story house with seven people helped her learn how to cooperate with others, she could get along with pretty much anyone (first interview, 2/7/2008). One important value that her parents emphasized was education; thus she tried to do her best in her schooling. Her K-12 schooling was

primarily with other Caucasian students, and didn't include anyone of any other race or ethnicity. Overall, she mentioned that she had positive learning experiences in her K-12 schooling. The following are several important events that she experienced before coming to the university. She described these events during her first interview on February 7th, 2008.

Experiences of being a newcomer. Because of the way her school district drew its boundaries, Julie had to go to a different school than all of her friends, both in sixth grade and in freshman year in high school. Julie explained that although she didn't know anyone when she started those years, being from a big family and having an outgoing personality contributed to her ability to make new friends easily. She was clear in her belief that this experience of being a newcomer in school had helped her anticipate what she would do when she has new students later.

Julie: I think now, when I see new students in a school, I kind of understand—not totally where they come from, because they sometimes change communities pretty drastically. But, I think as a teacher, I will go towards those students more, and help them figure out how things work, what the routines are, especially put them next to some other students that will be friendly with them (first interview, 2/7/2008).

Influence of her seventh-grade reading teacher. Julie mentioned that her seventh grade reading teacher was her main influence in terms of wanting to become a teacher. He used reading to engage the class in ways that none of her other teachers had done. For example, he used lots of interactive type of learning activities such as radio shows, skits, and reader's theater performances that were fun for the students as reading instruction. The students didn't even realize that they were building their literacy skills while taking part in these activities. In short, Julie was inspired by him because she thought that this kind of

engagement would be able to help students learn in a variety of curricular areas without recognizing that they were learning.

Experience of puppetry play group as an after school activity. The same seventh grade reading teacher also founded a puppetry play-group with his students as an after school activity. Julie was a member of this group, which visited retirement communities, children's hospitals, and Misericordia (a center for people with disabilities) in Chicago to perform their puppetry plays. Julie remembered that the whole experience surrounding this activity made a difference for her in two ways. First, she realized that there were people who did not enjoy the same advantages that she did. Second, she came to understand how she could make a difference in the community, just by entertaining people and making them happy for a day. This insight instilled in her the attitude that, if she had the means, she would help whoever she could.

Experiences of social studies classes in K-12 Schooling. Julie's experiences in her social studies classes were somewhat different in elementary, middle, and high school, respectively. Julie couldn't remember much about what she had studied in social studies before fourth grade except learning about Columbus. However, she recalled her fourth and fifth grade social studies classes as having a very engaging curriculum. In fourth grade social studies, she used an electronic Oregon Trail program, which focused on how the pioneers in America traveled west from the Mississippi River, giving her an idea of how these people made a long journey and what kinds of obstacles they had to face. In fifth grade social studies, she played a board game using dice, which illustrated how the Pilgrims had come to America. Her fifth grade year was also an election year, and so her class also

held a mock election for president, talking about issues related to the election that were understandable to elementary students.

Julie's middle school social studies classes, on the other hand, were very boring for her. Julie studied History of the Ancient World in sixth grade, geography in seventh grade, and American History in eighth grade. With the exception of a medieval fair in sixth grade, most of the social studies instruction during her middle school consisted of reading dry paragraphs from the textbook and memorization. Although the subject of social studies was always interesting to her, she didn't like how it was taught in middle school. In contrast, Julie recalled her social studies classes in high school as engaging and fun. For example, in American History class in her junior year, the students held a mock trial, debating the Vietnam War. Using primary resources, half the class pretended to be parents who were upset at the government, and the other half pretended to be the government. These two groups discussed whether America should stay involved in the Vietnam War. Another example from this class was a local history project, for which she researched a local ice cream parlor and its family history by conducting real-life interviews. During her senior year, she took a government class and an economics class, each for one semester. During the economics class, the students made their own stock portfolios and learned how the economic system in America works using information books. During the government class, the students completed a local government project, in which each group presented their plans for improving the city. As part of the project, the students had to attend a town meeting to figure out how local government works. On presentation day, they borrowed the city hall conference room and discussed which referenda would pass or which projects

would be implemented. Overall, Julie liked her high school social studies classes because she felt she was given more freedom and learned how to do research.

Learning about issues of diversity and social justice. When Julie was asked in what ways she had learned about the issues of diversity or social justice in her K-12 schooling, she mentioned a “two-day simulation activity” in fifth grade as the first time she learned about diversity. In this simulation, half of the class was assigned blue eyes and the other half was assigned brown eyes; the students’ assigned eye color was indicated by a sticker on their shirts. On the first day, the blue-eyed students were labeled as oppressed, and on the second day the brown-eyed were labeled the oppressed, so that all of the students could have the experience of being oppressed for one whole day. The students who were labeled oppressed had to sit against the wall, weren’t called on by the teachers, and were treated poorly. On the first day, the blue-eyed students couldn’t drink from the drinking fountains labeled, “For brown eyes only,” and on the second day, the brown-eyed students couldn’t drink from the fountains.

Julie identified this activity as eye-opening because it gave her the experience of how the oppressed felt, including anger. She realized that life was very difficult and unfair for oppressed people. Overall, she expressed that it was beneficial for her to think about equality issues in her almost completely White community. Julie remembered that after this activity, her teacher talked about the issue of fairness with the students, and in social studies class, they started to learn about the Civil War, but they didn’t get to the Civil Rights Movement at all. This fifth grade activity was Julie’s only memory about learning about diversity and social justice in her K-12 schooling.

Section 2: Influences from the social studies methods course. This section analyzes the influence of the social studies methods course on Julie's understanding and learning. It is divided into three sub-sections: (a) influence on her understanding of social studies, (b) learning related to particular topics and assignments, and (c) influence on her understanding of the issues of diversity and social justice. The data for this analysis come mainly from the first and the second interviews, Julie's weekly response papers, her reflection papers on class assignments, and e-mail communication.

(a) Influences on her understanding of social studies. While taking the social studies methods course, Julie developed a new understanding of the subject of social studies in several ways.

Social studies is more than history and is multidimensional. One significant change that occurred for Julie while taking the methods course was her expanded concept of what disciplines are included in social studies. Before taking this course, she regarded social studies as primarily history. She confessed, "I thought it was only history based. I didn't really think of politics and economics so much as social studies before the class. Or anthropology or any of the other disciplines such as psychology and sociology" (first interview, 2/7/2008). Julie attributed this change to the first day of the class, when they discussed the topic, "What is social studies?"

Julie: I think the first day of class we tried to answer the question, "What is social studies?" And we had put up all the disciplines we could think of, like anthropology, sociology, psychology, and that kind of opened it up for me, because I didn't really realize that social studies encompasses those many types of areas. And I think those other areas are the areas that we definitely forget when you give the kids the textbook and tell them to read it and answer the questions at the end (first interview, 2/7/2008).

As a researcher, I was curious why Julie thought of social studies as merely history before this course, even though she had taken a government class and an economics class in high school. She responded, “Since my high school classes were separated, History, Econ, Government, and not a Social Studies course, I never really made the connection that they were all related” (e-mail communication, 11/2/2008).

With the new understanding that social studies included many disciplines, Julie also came to see teaching social studies as multidimensional, including culture, art, and music. She also realized the necessity of integrating social studies with other subjects to make the lessons more meaningful to students, instead of merely reading social studies textbooks.

Jong-Hyun: In what ways have you changed or not changed your idea or perspectives about teaching social studies?

Julie: My perspective has changed from only history to something that is much more multidimensional. It has culture and art and music and everything integrated into it. Social studies is everything that is not math, science, and reading and writing. But you can certainly integrate all those aspects into a good social studies unit. I think there are tons of ways that you can integrate social studies with any subject. And that’s how you make it meaningful for students. Reading out of the textbook will not be exciting. I cannot even remember anything about the Middle Ages that I read in that textbook in sixth grade (second interview, 2/15/2008).

Purpose of social studies. As Julie’s perspectives about social studies expanded, her thoughts about the purpose of social studies also changed. Before taking this course, her answer to why students need to learn social studies was because “history is important to learn since it can repeat itself, and you should understand how the country has been formed, and how other countries interact with our country” (first interview, 2/7/2008).

After taking this course, Julie changed her conception of the purpose of social studies in relation to society and the world. Particularly, she mentioned two purposes why students need to learn social studies. One purpose was “to broaden students’ perspectives about the world” (second interview, 2/15/2008). This means to her that students need to understand how everything is interrelated rather than merely learning dates and facts, and to understand more than the European point of view when studying history. It appears that her new understanding that social studies is multidimensional contributed to her development of this expanded purpose.

The other purpose was “to find their place in the world and to figure out how they impact their society” (first interview, 2/7/2008). This meant to her that students need to develop the sense that they are part of their community and part of the world community, and to understand that they can impact their community and the world by understanding history, sociology, and all the different aspects of social studies. In short, students need to understand they are already members of society and their community, and they need to understand that they can develop community.

Social studies helps students become critical thinkers. While taking this course, Julie came to acknowledge the value of social studies, especially its power to help students become critical thinkers. She compared the different aspects of critical thinking in math and social studies.

Julie: I think there’s more in-depth critical thinking in social studies. In math, math can be a little bit more into critical thinking, but it’s a different way of critical thinking. It’s more of a logical, spatial type of critical thinking, where social studies is more interpersonal, and extra-personal because it’s how the students understand the world, and understand how it affects them. So, there’s a big kind of two-way

street, how you understand more about the world, and that helps you understand more about yourself and how you fit into the world. So, I think that's why social studies is a different aspect of critical thinking, because it makes students apply more concepts to them as humans, when math would just teach you some daily functioning and logic (second interview, 2/15/2008).

Julie confessed that discussing multiple perspectives in the methods course was a big factor that helped her realize the value of critical thinking in social studies. For instance, she mentioned the session of talking about maps as one example of how the class taught students to think about different perspectives. In this session, students looked at an inverted map and then discussed how it would make different students feel and how it could be used in the classroom. Julie explained that this lesson helped her think critically about different perspectives (first interview, 2/7/2008).

Acknowledging the value of critical thinking in social studies also made her feel a responsibility to her students in teaching social studies. That is, now she realized the necessity of delivering engaging, interesting social studies lessons to the students, so that the lessons could help students become critical thinkers, instead of simply giving students the textbooks. Julie mentioned that this feeling of responsibility was something significant she took away from the methods class (first interview, 2/7/2008).

(b) Learning related to particular topics and assignments. This sub-section analyzes particular topics and assignments that influenced Julie's learning from the social studies methods course. However, topics more directly related to issues of diversity and social justice will be discussed in next subsection.

Learning about multiple perspectives. Julie regarded discussing multiple perspectives as the most valuable aspect of the methods course for her. She mentioned how

several class sessions of this course addressed the concept of multiple perspectives. For instances, in learning about media literacy, the students talked about how different perspectives in the news can promote different views of the world and politics. In the geography session, the students discussed how looking at an inverted map could create different perceptions. Also, the students talked about the matter of whose history is represented in history textbooks. Particularly, Julie identified Takaki's book as a big influence on her thoughts about multiple perspectives. It made her realize that her understanding of history was a very small part of what occurred historically, and that history has many more perspectives than that of the White male, which she had been taught in her own schooling.

Julie: That [Reading Takaki's book] was meaningful to me because it brought up social studies issues that I felt I never knew about, or issues that weren't stressed in my classes where we just read the textbook. We only got the White male's perspective, and we didn't really get a more complex view of history. Takaki's book didn't focus on the White male's perspective, and it had different, primary sources embedded within it, so you could kind of step into the other people's shoes. You could kind of try to see what would the Civil War be like from the slaves' perspective? Or what would it be from the wealthy slave-owners' perspective? And it was interesting, because you could see those different perspectives. I think the point of that book, that there's multiple perspectives, was much more meaningful to me than the actual content (first interview, 2/7/2008).

One significant thing Julie did based on her learning about multiple perspectives was that she changed some of her lessons during her fall semester placement, where she was placed in a non-diverse classroom. She wanted to change the lessons to provide opportunities for her homogenous group of students to think about different perspectives while learning the story of Christopher Columbus.

Julie: In my own teaching, I changed some of my lessons during last semester, to make it more open to new perspectives, especially because I had a very non-diverse class. I actually used one of the books that Mary [her instructor] brought up, about Christopher Columbus, called *Encounter*, and I read that to the students. And we talked about the perspective of the native people, and the perspective of Columbus, and we talked about the matter that Columbus may not have understood a lot of things when he came over, and we tried to figure out what the natives would think of him. So I think that I see the value more this year than before about teaching with multiple perspectives (second interview, 2/15/2008).

Julie professed that one primary focus in her social studies lessons later would be multiple perspectives, because she knows that no matter what she teaches, she can incorporate multiple perspectives into her lessons (second interview, 2/15/2008). How Julie actually tried to incorporate multiple perspectives in her student teaching will be discussed in the analysis of her student teaching practices in the next section.

Combating stereotypes. The inaccuracy of negative stereotypes was another important realization from the methods course for Julie. She mentioned that several class sessions included discussions of stereotypes. One example was when the class read several children's stories about Columbus and Native Americans. In this session, the students discussed stereotypes about Native Americans, especially how Native Americans are stereotypically illustrated. Julie confessed, "Before this course I didn't know very much about the Native Americans. Now, I know that the books have very stereotypical portrayals of Native Americans. And there aren't really a lot of children's books to combat those" (second interview, 2/15/2008).

Another class activity that touched on the issue of negative stereotypes was their discussion of "diversity within groups." The main point of the discussion was the fact that there is as much diversity within a group as between groups. For instance, in a presentation

about the United States, you can't just say that everyone wears T-shirts and jeans, because not everyone wears T-shirts and jeans. Likewise, in talking about East Asians, you can't simply say that they are all good at math and science, because some aren't. From this discussion, Julie came to realize how creating a stereotype for a group is wrong, because there is so much diversity within the group.

Julie stated that in her social studies teaching later, she would like to teach about the problems with negative stereotypes. She already had some thoughts about how she would teach about stereotypes.

Julie: I think, for stereotypes, one way to start is by defining what a stereotype would be, and trying to figure out why that stereotype has been developed over time. See how the media interacts with that stereotype, and how books have affected it, too. And then figure out why no one has said anything against the stereotype to disprove it. I think an activity like that would help students to understand that stereotypes are socially created, and they aren't necessarily true, as most stereotypes aren't necessarily true (second interview, 2/15/2008).

Learning from school community inquiry. Julie regarded the inquiry about the school community assignment as a valuable experience because it provided her a real life application. This assignment required groups of students to research the schools and communities in which they would be placed in the upcoming fall semester. The students were asked to take a tour of the school neighborhood and to conduct interviews with the school and community members.

Julie's fall semester placement school was in a rural area, and she had her own preconceptions about what the school and community would be like, because both of her parents came from a rural farm-type small towns. However, while doing the inquiry about her school community, Julie realized some of her preconceptions were false, while some of

them were true. For example, one preconception about the community that proved true was that the community people were very involved in sports, as many small-town people often are. Even if they didn't play sports, the members of the community placed importance on them. Another preconception she found to be true was that there wasn't much discussion about people different from themselves. In contrast, she realized she had had a false preconception about the students being very closed-minded. She thought that the students would have similar opinions to their parents, but she found that they were actually beginning to form their own opinions. For example, when she taught a lesson about some Native American tribes, she found that the students were very interested in this different way of life and were eager to understand it.

Julie mentioned that this inquiry allowed her to see the community from a broad perspective, including both assets and challenges. Also, it made her realize the importance of coming to understand a particular community, because every community is different (reflection paper on this inquiry). She admitted that before this course, she had never thought of this inquiry into the school community as something that a teacher needed to do. After conducting this inquiry, she said, "Now I think when I teach later I'll actually research the community more in-depth to figure out what the kids are going through, and what kinds of perspectives are in the community" (first interview, 2/7/2008).

(c) Influences related to the issues of diversity and social justice. This sub-section focuses on analyzing Julie's learning from the methods course related to diversity and social justice.

Diversity is more than racial differences. Before taking the methods course, Julie primarily thought of diversity as related to racial differences. Julie admitted that through this course she learned that there are other forms of diversity. Particularly, Julie remembered several topics that influenced her learning. For example, watching the video about teaching gay and lesbian issues in elementary school helped her think about different sexual orientations, and discussing problems with negative stereotypes helped her realize that there is diversity both within groups and between groups. In addition, talking about bilingual issues provided her the opportunity to consider diversity in terms of language. Julie explained that she became more aware that diversity is a huge concept, which encompasses a lot of things rather than simply racial differences (second interview, 2/15/2008).

Inequity for women in American history. Working on a group unit plan provided the opportunity for Julie to think about inequities for women in American history. For this assignment, her group created “Herstory - Where are the Women?”, a unit for 5th graders. Her group gathered background information, interviewing a group of 5th grade students about why women were not included in American history books, and wrote several lessons that included women’s stories and accomplishments in many fields. Examples of these lessons were “Women Writers: Author Study,” “Women in Politics”, “Women in Math and Science” and “Women and Civil Rights.”

While Julie was working on this assignment, three things particularly contributed to her more critical consideration of inequity problems for women in American history. First, her group discussion, which focused on why women are left out of the textbooks,

made her realize that there really weren't women in her history textbooks. Second, when Julie prepared her own lesson on women in math, she found that there were women mathematicians that no one has ever heard of, because they are not in the textbooks. Thus, Julie wrote a lesson about how the students could research female mathematicians or scientists so that they would understand their contributions to the math and science world. Third, students' explanations for the lack of women in the textbooks caused her to realize their misconceptions related to this issue. For example, one student suggested, "Maybe they just didn't come over. When the Pilgrims came over, the men came over, but they left all the women in Europe?" Students seemed to have the belief that either women weren't around at all, or women didn't do anything important for society. The students' responses motivated Julie to become more concerned about the inequities of women in American history. Julie explained, "I think as our society is built on men and women, it is important for students to understand that it's not just men" (first interview, 2/7/2008).

In sum, when Julie was asked how the methods course influenced her perspective about the issues of diversity and social justice, Julie stated, "I think I became more aware of the issues. Discussing diversity and social justice definitely helped me grow as an educator because I wasn't necessarily aware of how to talk to students about these issues" (e-mail communication, 11/2/2008).

Section 3: Analyzing student teaching practices. This section focuses on analyzing Julie's student teaching practices related to her learning from the methods course. Information about her class contexts and her cooperating teacher, and overall information

about what she taught as social studies lessons will be provided first, followed by the analysis of her student teaching practices.

Class contexts and cooperating teacher, Mrs. Kelsey. Julie's full time student teaching placement in the spring semester was a sixth grade social studies classroom in a middle school in an urban area. The student demographics in this school were 40 percent African American, 10 percent Latino, 5 percent Asian American, and 45 percent White. Unlike the other two participants in this study, Julie only taught the subject of social studies, so she had about 85 students, divided into 4 class hours. Thus, during the three weeks of her full time student teaching, Julie taught the same lesson four times almost every day.

Julie's cooperating teacher, Mrs. Kelsey, had taught in this middle school for nine years after having worked as a substitute teacher for one year. She had taken teacher education classes to earn her undergraduate degree at Eastern Illinois University, with a minor in psychology. During her first seven years of teaching, Mrs. Kelsey had taught math, reading, and English, but never social studies. However, two years ago she was assigned to teach sixth grade social studies, because her minor in psychology counted as social science. Mrs. Kelsey confessed that she hadn't wanted to teach social studies, because she didn't know anything about the sixth grade social studies content--ancient civilizations. During her subsequent two years of social studies teaching, another sixth grade social studies teacher who had taught it for a long time helped her prepare her lessons. Mrs. Kelsey stated, "now I really like to teach social studies because I have found that I like studying ancient civilizations" (interview with Julie's cooperating teacher, 5/22/2008). Her main goal of

teaching ancient civilization in sixth grade social studies was to help students understand past human history, especially how human civilization has evolved.

Mrs. Kelsey stated that she had wanted to be a teacher since she was very young. She and her sister always played school on a huge chalkboard in her basement. Originally she thought she wanted to teach little kids, but then realized that she preferred middle school-aged students, after substituting for a year in middle school right after college.

For three consecutive years, Mrs. Kelsey has had a full time student teacher each spring semester. Mrs. Kelsey stated that her main goal for her student teachers was “trying to teaching them everything by showing them the real life of teachers” (interview with Julie’s cooperating teacher, 5/22/2008). Because Mrs. Kelsey realized that her previous two student teachers thought teaching included just planning and teaching, she wanted Julie to learn everything that a teacher must deal with. With this purpose in mind, Mrs. Kelsey helped Julie learn how to communicate with parents, how to handle student behavior, and how collaborate with other teachers, in addition to planning and teaching.

Overall information about what Julie taught in her social studies lessons. Before Julie started full time student teaching in April, she taught several lessons that her cooperating teacher assigned her. I observed some of these lessons, such as “Zhou Dynasty—Confucianism, Daoism and Legalism,” “Four Forms of Government in Ancient Greece,” and “Athens and Sparta.”

During Julie’s three weeks of full time student teaching, she taught a unit on Ancient Rome. Since there were no textbooks for this unit, Julie had to prepare the unit herself, although she adapted several lessons from the *History Alive* curriculum guide. Julie

prepared this unit in order for the students to learn about various aspects of Ancient Rome, such as daily life, social classes, Roman innovations, Roman Republicanism, Julius Caesar, and Roman roads and trade. When she taught these lessons during her full time student teaching, I observed all of her first hour lessons.

Julie's student teaching practices are organized in two sub-sections: (a) her teaching practices related to her learning from the methods class and (b) her teaching practices related to diversity and social justice. The data for this analysis come mainly from my field notes from observing her teaching, the second and third interviews, her lesson plans and e-mail reflections during her student teaching, and e-mail communication.

(a) Julie's teaching practices related to her learning from the methods course.

This subsection analyzes how Julie tried to incorporate what she had learned from the methods course into her student teaching practices. Her teaching practices that directly related to diversity and social justice will be discussed in the next subsection.

Making her lessons interesting and meaningful by using trade books and integration. When preparing her lessons, one aspect Julie was very concerned about was making her lessons as interesting and meaningful to the students as possible, so that the students would be more engaged and eager to learn.

It was the first day that Julie was charged to do full-time student teaching. Before starting her first hour class, Julie had already placed three books about Ancient Rome at each student table, at which usually three or four students sat. Julie started her lesson by saying "I want to see what you guys know about ancient Rome. Is that totally something that you never thought of before? Or maybe something that you know about but you're not sure? So, I have at each table three books about ancient Rome. What you will do is for about 15 minutes look at them, and we will talk about what you found out from these books. Look at something interesting." Students started to look at books and Julie started looking around at how students

were doing. Since the books on the students' tables were trade books on Ancient Rome, with many illustrations, it appeared that the students were mostly looking at the interesting illustrations first, and then reading some information related to the illustrations. A few students were looking at their books independently. However, many students who seemed to have found interesting illustrations and information showed their books to the student next to them, and they chatted about what they'd read. Some students were giggling while they were looking at their books. While looking around, Julie also chatted with several students about what they found in their books. The classroom was a little noisy because of the chatter among the students, but this showed that the students were interested in looking at the trade books. After the students had spent about 15 minutes looking at the books, Julie asked the students, "What you know about Rome? Raise your hands and tell me something that you learned from reading the books. Or something you already knew before but you learned more information about." An African-American boy said, "I learned you have to be five-seven to be in the Roman army." Julie responded, "Woo, could you be in the Roman army?" "Yeah, I am tall enough." A White girl said, "Gladiators were forced to fight." Whenever the students volunteered something, Julie wrote their answers on the "What we Know" chart on the whiteboard. A White boy said, "I found out the Colosseum was used for chariot races." Another White girl said, "Some people had three names, and also had a nickname." Another boy talked about soldiers and medicines. Now, Julie asked the students, "What do you want to know more about, about Ancient Rome?" One White boy said, "What they did daily?" Julie responded, "Their daily life, that topic we will do tomorrow." Again, whenever the students said something, Julie wrote it down on the "What we Want to Know" chart on the whiteboard. Another White boy said, "How did they fight, about their weapons." A girl said, "What religions, what gods did they believe?" Now, Julie said to them, "During this unit, we will talk about gladiators, soldiers, religions, daily life and other topics. Also, I will keep these books in the classroom, so you can find answers about some of questions from our lessons" (fieldnotes, 4/9/2008).

As the vignette above shows, one strategy that Julie employed to make her lesson interesting was the use of trade books as her introductory activity to the Ancient Rome unit. In particular, she used kid-friendly, easy-to-read read trade books with many illustrations, such as *Life in Ancient Rome* by Kaufman (1997), *100 things you should know about Ancient Rome* by MacDonald (2004), *You wouldn't want to be a Roman Gladiator* by Malam and Salariya (2003), *You wouldn't want to be a Roman soldier* by Stewart (2006),

and *Growing up in Ancient Rome* by Corbishley and Molan (1997). The students enjoyed looking at the books since they didn't feel overwhelmed by the content. In addition, Julie took an advantage of the students' findings from the books as an introduction to the KWL chart, and the class talked about what more they wanted to learn about Ancient Rome. Overall, Julie's original plan of using trade books seemed to successfully motivate the students to about learn Ancient Rome.

Julie explained that the main purpose of using trade books as an opening activity was just to get the students interested in some aspects of the unit, since she didn't want the students to feel overwhelmed from the beginning of the unit. Also, she said that talking about using trade books in the methods class had helped her plan this opening activity, although in the methods class the focus was more on teaching concepts than sparking interest (e-mail reflection during her student teaching, 4/10/2008). Overall, Julie felt that she had met her goal of sparking student interest, since most students seemed engaged and were willing to participate.

Another teaching approach that Julie adopted from the methods class into many lessons in her Ancient Rome unit was integrating other subjects such as writing, science, and math (third interview, 5/19/2008). For example, in a two-day lesson called "Social Classes in Rome," Julie integrated the social studies content with a writing activity. The main objective of this lesson was to allow students to research social classes among women, slaves, gladiators, and soldiers in Ancient Rome. In order to make this lesson more interesting and meaningful, Julie included a writing activity, in which the students were asked to write up their research in the form of a short newspaper article (e-mail reflection

during her student teaching, 4/25/2008). In this lesson, the students were given a choice of which social class they would research, and Julie provided the students with handouts containing information about each social class. On the first day, after the students finished researching the handouts of their chosen social classes, they were asked to write a draft of a short newspaper article using the 5 W's (who, what, where, when, and why). On the second day, the students had the opportunity to get exchange their drafts with two peers and get feedback, and they were then asked to revise their drafts based on their peers' suggestions. Julie's intention of including this peer feedback process was to offer the opportunity for students to think about the editing process, especially how good writing takes a lot of time and effort (Julie's lesson plan for Social Classes in Rome).

Some other examples of Julie's integration of writing, math, or science into her Ancient Rome unit were: (a) "Romulus and Remus"—integrated with a creative writing activity, in which, after the students learned about the myth of Romulus and Remus, they were asked to create their own myths about the origin of their own city; (b) "Patricians and Plebians"—integrated with a persuasive writing activity, in which students were asked to pretend to be either a patrician or a plebian from Ancient Rome and write a speech addressing the Senate to persuade them to change the laws to be fairer for Plebians; (c) "Roman Roads"—integrated with an algebra activity, in which, after the students learned why building roads in Rome was necessary, they calculated the cost of building a mile of road using worksheets that provided a basic formula; (d) "Roman Numerals"—integrated with a math activity, in which, after the students learned some background information about Roman numerals, they practiced using them as if they were in a Roman marketplace,

thus learning symbolic representations for numbers; and (e) “Gods and Goddesses”—integrated with a science activity, in which the students were asked to research and create a PowerPoint presentation about a planet, and then discuss the relationship between the Roman gods and the planets. Unfortunately, Julie had a job interview when this lesson was scheduled to be taught, so it was taught by Julie’s cooperating teacher, and it was impossible for me to observe her teaching of this lesson.

Besides the use of trade books and the integration of other subjects, Julie also initially planned to integrate an artifact into her unit to capture student interest in her unit. When she was asked what she planned for her unit, Julie answered:

I also try to integrate artifacts into my unit, because I think students can learn about things in more concrete ways. I hope to go to the Krannert Art Museum and figure out if they have any kind of posters, ... They have a lot of actual, tangible recreations of like clay pots and things like that. I hope to integrate those, so they can have a more hands-on understanding of history” (second interview, 2/15/2008).

Unfortunately, when Julie went to the Krannert Art Museum, she didn't find anything useful there. She did use the picture resources from her cooperating teacher for teaching “Ancient Roman Buildings” lesson, however. Each picture showed a Roman building in a modern-day context, with a transparency on top to show what the building looked like in Ancient Rome. Julie also used the Internet to find videos from the Discovery Channel School when she taught about Julius Caesar. The topic of how to use artifacts and the Internet to make social studies lessons more meaningful and interesting was addressed in the methods course, and it seemed that Julie utilized her learning related to that topic in her student teaching.

Employing small group discussion. Employing small group discussion was another teaching strategy that Julie used, which she mentioned she had learned from the methods course (third interview, 5/19/2008). What Julie disliked about her cooperating teacher's style was her over-reliance on independent work and little use of group discussion. Julie said that her cooperating teacher seemed to think that the students would not understand group discussion because they would just use what their partner says (third interview, 5/19/2008). In contrast, Julie thought that although some students hadn't developed the social skills to really discuss the topics, the only way they would develop such skills is by working with each other, so she utilized small group discussion in her lessons.

Another reason why Julie utilized small group discussion was because she believed the students would not learn as much if they didn't talk about what they were learning.

Julie gave one worksheet to each table. Five tables had three students each, and one table had four students. Julie asked for a volunteer to read the first sentence of the worksheet. An African-American girl read it: "Your table was made by the best engineers in Ancient Rome. The emperor urges you to help him with many problems in the country. Read each problem and discuss possible solutions with your group." Julie said, "Thank you. We have four bullets and four questions. I will read the first bullet. 'You need to find a way for soldiers to travel even during bad weather... The thick mud prevents them from protecting neighboring cities. If they could travel faster, they would be able to save more lives.' The discussion question is, 'How can you make the soldiers' travel easier?' Your group's job is to talk about it and write your answer. After your group answers the question, go to the next question. Start talking about the first answer." Now, each group started to discuss their answer to the first question and Julie looked around the classroom... Later, Julie came to one group to check how they were doing with their discussion. Showing their group answer to Julie, an African-American boy asked her, "Is this the wrong answer?" Julie said, "No." Looking at the whole class, Julie said in a loud voice, "There is no really wrong answer for this, just a couple of discussion questions for making you think" (fieldnotes, 4/28/2008).

The vignette above is one example of how Julie provided a small group discussion opportunity for the students to think about the questions and discuss their ideas. For this particular lesson, “Roman Roads,” Julie posed 4 scenarios asking such questions as “How can you make the soldiers’ travel easier?” and “How can you help transport the animals from Africa to Rome?” Although possibly the best solution for answering all 4 scenarios was to build roads, Julie praised other inventive ideas that the students suggested when the whole class talked about each group’s solutions. For example, one group’s suggestion was to put the horses and chariots on sleds so they could navigate the mud easier. Another group’s idea was to put down wooden planks for the army and then the last soldier would pick up the last plank and then run up to the front to extend their trail. In fact, Julie expressed later, “I didn’t anticipate the amount of creative responses for solving these problems. To me, it’s obvious that roads would be the answer, but some students came up with elaborate solutions” (e-mail reflection during her student teaching, 4/29/2008).

Although Julie also used independent seatwork occasionally for some of her lessons, as her cooperating teacher did, she employed small group discussion in many of her lessons. In order to give some sense of both how Julie utilized small group discussion and how the students worked on it, two short stories that Julie employed for group discussion are provided. In the “Athens and Sparta” lesson, after Julie taught about the different government structures of Athens and Sparta, she had the students do a small group discussion about the question, “Which type of government would you like to live under? Why?” When Julie checked the groups’ answers by voting after the group discussions, some groups voted for Athens, since everyone can have voice in Athens. In contrast, some

groups voted for Sparta, since they thought old people have more common sense than younger people, but several students objected to the idea that old people have more common sense (fieldnotes, 4/1/2008).

In another lesson, called “Roman Buildings,” Julie used large pictures for studying Ancient Roman buildings such as the Basilica of Maxentius, the Colosseum, the Roman Forum, and Circus Maximus. Each picture showed the image of a Roman building in a modern-day context and had a transparency on top to show the image of what the building looked like in Ancient Rome. Seeing both images, each group was asked to discuss such questions as, “How do you think this structure impacts the modern-day culture of Rome?” “What could be the reasons for these differences?” and “What does this structure tell you about Ancient Roman culture?” During the whole class presentation, one White boy said, “The reason for ruin is natural disaster. If I lived in Rome, I would want to rebuild the Colosseum using the same materials and techniques,” and many students applauded him (fieldnotes, 4/25/2008).

Julie expressed her satisfaction about this small group discussion teaching method, because she thought the students liked it and because they learned how to discuss in addition to the learning the content.

Julie: A lot of students told me that they liked my teaching better, because they actually got to talk about things, and it wasn’t all just silent in the classroom. So I think they learned a lot. A lot more about, kind of like, how to discuss, really, in addition to the content (third interview, 5/19/2008).

Studying multiple perspectives. Julie was able to put her desire to teach from multiple perspectives into practice during a two-day lesson called “Effects of Roman

Expansion” (second interview, 2/15/2008). Julie prepared this particular lesson by adapting resources from the *History Alive* curriculum guide, but she clearly stated, “the idea of studying multiple perspectives and trying to understand another’s point of view came directly from the methods class” (e-mail reflection during her student teaching, 4/30/2008).

The main goal of this lesson was to learn about different perspectives on Rome’s military expansion. The students studied the perspectives of eight historical figures on Roman expansion, including Fulvia, Hortensia, Julius Caesar, Sallust, Marcus Cicero, Gaius Gracchus, Spartacus, and Tiberius Gracchus. On the first day of this lesson, Julie assigned the class to eight groups, each consisting of two or three students. Next, she gave each group a different handout with information about one of the historical figures mentioned about. Each group was asked to study the handout and discuss whether the historical person believed that military expansion helped or hurt Rome, and why. Thus, each group became an expert on one of the eight people. The next day, Julie had each group present their work to the whole class. For example, Marcus Cicero’s group reported, “Cicero believed that military expansion hurt Rome. His point was that the government was weakened because so many powerful people who were unpatriotic used troops to increase their own power during military expansion.” The group that studied Fulvia said, “Fulvia believed that military expansion helped Rome. Her main point was that because of the expansion, Rome got taxes from other areas, so it made Rome richer.”

During each group’s presentation, each student was asked to fill out a worksheet about the other historical figures’ perspectives on Roman expansion and their points. By doing this, the students could learn about the other seven historical figures’ perspectives.

After all eight groups finished presenting, Julie asked the students to write a paragraph explaining “whose perspective you agree with and why” (field-notes, 4/29/2008 & 4/30/2008).

When Julie was asked how she felt the lesson went, she confessed that she felt it wasn’t very effective because she didn’t realize some important aspects of the lesson until she had taught it four times.

Julie: For the Roman expansion one, I think that wasn’t as effective for multiple perspectives. That was when they had eight historical figures. I think they kind of understood part of it. But I didn’t even fully understand it until the fourth hour—our last social studies hour—where one person said, “Hey, all the people who think that expansion was a good thing were the rich people.” Then I looked back, and I realized, yeah, all the wealthy people did think it was a good thing, and all the poor people thought it was a bad thing. I didn’t even catch that, until I taught it four times (third interview, 5/19/2008).

As already mentioned, it is certain that Julie’s goal of teaching multiple perspectives was evident in this lesson, and the students were exposed to the concept of multiple perspectives. However, Julie’s confession of her not having fully understood the content of this lesson implies that in preparing the lesson, she didn’t think much about the more fundamental goal of exploring multiple perspectives. For example, in this lesson, she missed the opportunity for students to discuss the motivation for these different positions and why people might have different perspectives on the same situation. Realizing that she missed the main point of this lesson, Julie said that she would make this lesson more of a discussion if she taught it again later. Julie also mentioned that after the student in the fourth period class noticed that the figures who thought Roman expansion helped Rome were all from wealthy families, the class had a good discussion during which many of the

students contributed their opinions about how an individual's point of view can be influenced by their social position (e-mail reflection during her student teaching, 5/1/2008).

Julie encountered two practical difficulties in preparing this lesson. One was time constraint. The original lesson in *History Alive* would have lasted four or five days, but Julie had to shorten it, because the school's curricular demands did not afford her that much time. The other difficulty was finding useful resources for integrating multiple perspectives. Julie said, "I would not have been able to do this lesson if I didn't have the resources from the guide. I think I would have trouble doing similar lessons since the resources may not be available for every time period and place" (e-mail reflection during her student teaching, 5/1/2008). It seemed that while Julie clearly recognized the necessity of studying multiple perspectives, she was concerned about how to prepare such a lesson.

Making connections to modern days. Julie expressed that she had learned a new concept about history from the methods course: that history is not merely past events, but is also related to modern times (third interview, 5/19/2008). Since I, as a researcher, was curious about how much this new concept had influenced her lesson preparations for the Ancient Rome unit, I asked her about this matter:

Jong-Hyun: After taking the social studies methods class, you changed to understand that history is also related to our time. So, based on this new learning, did you think about making some connection between the Ancient Rome topic or issue to modern days in your lessons?

Julie: Um, I didn't do that too much. Um, in my Roman Buildings lesson, when I showed them large pictures of the buildings as they would have been in ancient times, and then today, I tried to get them to think about what the Italians would think about these ruins now. Um, would they be proud of them? Would they think that they're just ugly? Would they want to restore them? We kind of talked about that. And then I don't think in any other lesson we really talked too much about the

modern day, because the whole class is Ancient History. We tried to connect the government one, about republic and modern day democracy. But again, a lot of them didn't know very much about modern day democracy, so the connections were kind of thin there [laughing].

Jong-Hyun: Yeah, because my point is whether the students could start or could have some concept that history is not just past fact, or past event. Because many students may think, "Oh, this is ancient situation, Ancient Rome. We need to just memorize the fact, the time, the day, or the people's name." But how they are not having that kind of concept? So did you try to make change that kind of concept?

Julie: I guess not really. I mean, the curriculum guide drove my unit, and in fifteen days I don't really know how to do it, so much. I wish I would have, maybe if I had had practice with that in the methods class, because I don't know how to do it.

Jong-Hyun: Yeah, because what I heard from many students why they don't like social studies is just reading book and memorization, so there is no connection in our life. As you told me, the curriculum guide already focused on just only—

Julie: Culture.

Jong-Hyun: But even culture, did you think about—you already did something, I guess. But did you think about how making some connection about the cultural issue in ancient Rome and modern times?

Julie: I think...I didn't see myself any connection that I felt the kids could understand. Because they're eleven, and they don't read the newspaper, and I feel that if we were trying to connect modern day concepts, that it would be...first you would have to teach the modern day concepts, and then the ancient concepts. And then, teach a day on the similarities and differences. So that would be, like, a three day lesson on something that you only have one day for [laughing]. Um, because even when I tried to teach the difference between a republic and a democracy, they had no idea that America had a senate, and that was the main thing that we got from the Romans, and I wanted them to make the connection that, "Oh, we got the senate from the Romans," but you can't really do that unless they know what a senate is and how it's used. That was definitely a struggle because they had not had American History yet (third interview, 5/19/2008).

As the long conversation above indicates, regarding my two questions about making connections between Ancient Rome and modern days, Julie responded: "I didn't do that too much," and "I guess not really." She seemed unsure of how to do this, and she also thought

that it was difficult to do because of the students' lack of understanding about current connections.

However, besides the two lessons "Roman Building" and "The Early Roman Republic and American Government," which Julie mentioned in the conversation above, I also found two other lessons in which she compared Ancient Rome and modern day America.

One lesson was the two-day "Daily Life in Rome," which she adopted directly from the *History Alive* curriculum guide. In this lesson, students were asked to compare aspects of Roman daily life with modern-day life in America. Reading information worksheets independently, the students were asked to write about the differences between the two cultures in terms of education, family life, healthcare, housing, travel and trade, food and drink, law and order, and recreation. Some example answers that the students wrote were that, in terms of educational life, "Students in Rome graduated at 16, which is earlier than now," or "Students used small wooden waxed boards instead of real paper." Although the main goal of this lesson was to introduce different aspects of Ancient Roman daily life to the students, the students also had the opportunity to compare them with the modern day (fieldnotes, 4/15/2008).

Another lesson that Julie provided the students to compare Ancient Rome with modern day America was "The Fall of Rome," which she also adopted from the *History Alive* curriculum guide. Unfortunately, because Julie's cooperating teacher taught this lesson, I could not observe it. But Julie's original lesson plan showed that while the main goal of this lesson was to study 10 theories on the Fall of Rome, the students were also

asked to identify similarities and differences between Ancient Rome and modern American society. Analyzing political cartoons about modern day American society, the students had an opportunity to compare the two cultures in terms of issues such as inflation, unemployment, expanding money for the military to the exclusion of education, and political corruption (Julie's lesson plan for "Fall of Rome").

In fact, it appeared that at least in four lessons, Julie provided activities for the students to compare between Ancient Rome and modern days. There was one important difference among the four lessons. Julie made "The Early Roman Republic and American Government" lesson based on her own ideas, although she also had to use some informational resources from the curriculum guide. In contrast, Julie directly adopted the three lessons "Daily Life in Rome" "Roman Building", and "The Fall of Rome" from curriculum guide, making few changes. Julie recognized that in preparing the "Daily Life in Rome" lesson she adopted the idea of comparing the past with today from the methods class, because she thought it could help students connect to the material (e-mail reflection during her student teaching, 4/15/2008). Also, Julie confessed why she used the "Fall of Rome" lesson from the curriculum guide:

I didn't think of this lesson on my own, but after I read the *History Alive* curriculum guide, I saw that there were a lot of good comparisons. I hoped that this would be a good way to compare the two cultures in ways that would make it meaningful for the students (e-mail communication, 11/2/2008).

In spite of the fact that Julie provided the students with opportunities to compare Ancient Rome with modern days at least in four lessons in fifteen days, I am curious why she responded negatively to my questions above.

My own interpretation is that her difficulties with incorporating her new concept of history into her actual practice motivated her to answer negatively. Surely, Julie began with good intentions in “The Early Roman Republic and American Government,” in which she intended the students to make some connection between the Roman Republic and American democracy. Particularly, she wanted them to realize that the American senate originated from the Roman government. However, because of a lack of students’ prior knowledge about American government, Julie struggled to teach this connection, which fostered her perception of the practical difficulty of making connections between past history and modern days. Julie’s two answers—“I don’t really know how to do it so much. I wish I would have, maybe had practice with that in the methods class because I don’t know how to do it,” and “I didn’t see myself any connection that I felt the kids could understand”—seem to indicate that her big concern about this matter was how to implement it. As Julie prepared for “The Early Roman Republic and American Government” on her own, she had some thoughts about making connections with modern days, but her struggle with this lesson motivated her to think more about how to do it. In later e-mail communication, Julie wrote:

I would have liked to know how to create meaningful activities based on a curriculum guide. I don’t always know what will work, but I guess that really comes from experience. I think the methods class sometimes skipped over the practical aspects of teaching, like how to take a concept and transform it into a meaningful and engaging lesson. I would have liked to have more strategies to engage students and to help them connect with the material (e-mail communication, 11/2/2008).

In short, it appears that Julie tried to incorporate her new concept about history into her lessons as demonstrated when she planned “The Early Roman Republic and American

Government” on her own. But she also seemed to struggle with teaching this lesson and wanted to know more about the practical aspects of how to implement this kind of lesson.

Comparison between her teaching of multiple perspectives and her teaching of connecting modern times. Since analyzing both her teaching of multiple perspectives and her teaching of connecting modern times provided important points in terms of understanding her teaching practices, a short comparison between the two follows, with a particular focus on the differences.

Julie included both goals—teaching multiple perspectives and making connections to current times—when the curriculum guide materials incorporated them into the lessons. There are examples of her including these when she used *History Alive*, which includes both these goals.

While she acknowledges the influence of the methods course on her conception of both of these goals, she seems to have a clearer understanding about incorporating multiple perspectives than making connections to current times. For the latter, she seems to make connections, as with the architecture then and now, when she thinks that the students will be able to understand the comparisons. In contrast, she is uncertain about how to make the connections when she doesn’t think that the students have the background information to understand the comparison, as in the connection between the Roman Senate and the U.S. Senate. When she is uncertain about how to develop these goals practically in the classroom, there is less evidence of it in her teaching. When she is more confident about how to incorporate a goal into her teaching, as with multiple perspectives, she thinks about it as she is planning and there is more evidence of it in her planning and teaching. When she

is less able to put the goal of making current connections into practice, there is less evidence of it in her practice.

In summary, there seems to be more clarity for Julie at the conceptual level than the practical level. She acknowledges that more experience may be required to actually integrate these goals well into her teaching. In one sense, Julie's teaching practices can be regarded as typical of a new teacher. New teachers don't always know how to put their goals into practice, and they get little actual practical experience during the field placement portion of the methods course to try and do this. Also, Ancient Rome may be a difficult topic for making connections to current society, although the *History Alive* curriculum does try to do this. If she had been teaching about the Civil War or other historical periods more directly connected to current times, maybe she would have found this goal easier to put into practice.

(b) Julie's teaching practices related to diversity and social justice. This subsection focuses on analyzing Julie's teaching related to diversity and social justice, and describes her thoughts about teaching diversity and social justice after her student teaching practicum.

Two lessons that Julie planned to address social justice issues in the Ancient Rome unit. On the first day of her full-time student teaching for the Ancient Rome unit, I asked Julie whether she had planned to address the issues of diversity and social justice in her unit. Responding to my question, Julie mentioned two lessons that she thought would encourage the students to think about social justice issues in Ancient Roman society. She stated that in "Patricians and Plebians," the students would be writing speeches about why the unfair

laws for Plebians needed to be changed. She also anticipated that when the students researched different social classes in “Social Classes in Rome” they would think about the unfairness for both women, because they had no rights, and gladiators, because they were forced to fight (e-mail reflection during her student teaching, 4/10/08). When Julie actually taught these two lessons, “Patricians and Plebians” succeeded in helping the students address the social justice issue she had expected. In contrast, it appeared that the “Social Classes in Rome” lesson didn’t have much success in terms of making the students think about unfair situations for some classes.

In the “Patricians and Plebians” lesson, Julie set as her lesson goal that the students would identify the injustice of the Plebians’ status and would write a speech to advocate for change. In the previous day’s lesson, “The Early Roman Republic and American Government,” the students had learned basic information about the Patricians and Plebians and the different rights of the two classes. Then, in this lesson, after reading a short article with more information on Patricians and Plebians, each student was asked to become either a Patrician or a Plebian and to write a speech from the point of view of that character to explain what laws were unfair and why. It appeared that many students were indeed able to identify the injustices in Ancient Roman society, and they focused their speeches on asking for changes in laws unfair to the Plebians, as Julie had expected. For example, one student who was pretending to be a Plebian wrote a speech asking for a change in the slave laws:

Dear Honorable Senators, the law I think unfair is slavery. I think that we Plebians should not be slaves and treated badly because we didn’t have money. Just because we didn’t have money we could get turned into slaves made me feel really bad. I think you could change this law by making pay go up.

Another student who was pretending to be a gladiator pointed out the unfairness of debt bondage and highlighted the gladiators' rights as human being, saying:

Dear Honorable Senators, I'm a famous gladiator. I believe debt bondage is unfair because I shouldn't have to fight wild beast and other gladiators because I asked someone for money. It makes me feel like I'm just a toy being played with day after day after. Only I'm not a toy, I'm a human being.

During this lesson, when Julie saw that several students had already finished their speeches before the end of class, she asked to them to read their books silently so the other students could continue working. Indeed, I, as a researcher, was expecting that Julie might lead some kind of whole class discussion touching on the injustices for the Plebians before finishing this lesson, this didn't happen at all. When the bell rang, Julie asked the students who hadn't finished their writing to do it as homework (fieldnotes, 4/18/2008).

Julie later reflected on her teaching of this lesson in response to several of my questions, including: "Did you use any learning from the methods class?" "How did you feel about how the lesson went?" and "What will you change about this lesson if you do it again?" She stated that reading about a lesson in the methods class in which students pretended to be historical characters and wrote diary entries inspired this particular lesson. She liked this activity because students seem to become engaged when they can pretend to be someone else. She thought that students could learn a lot of information that way because they have to step into another person's shoes. Julie also thought that in this lesson, she had touched on the issue of social justice, because the students had to analyze human rights issues related to the Plebians, and thus learned that the laws were unjust for Plebians. Analyzing the students' speeches, Julie evaluated that the students either explained well

how the law affected Rome if they were Patricians, or how the unjust law made them feel bad if they were Plebians (e-mail reflection during her student teaching, 4/19/2008).

In addition, Julie mentioned that if she did this lesson again later, she would allow the students to read their speeches aloud, since she thought they would really enjoy it and would be able to hear everyone else's opinion about the topic. By doing this, she expected that the students could understand more fully what the other side's perspective may have been, since each student only wrote on one side of the issue. Because I didn't observe any class discussion in this lesson, I asked why she didn't have discussion about the social justice issues at end of the lesson. Her response was:

I wish I would have discussed with the class at the end. But, some students needed the entire time to write while others got done in just 20 minutes. So, I didn't want to discuss and reflect on the activity when many students were still working on them (e-mail reflection during her student teaching, 4/19/2008).

It seemed that ability difference among the students was an obstacle to providing discussion time during this lesson.

Unlike the "Patricians and Plebians" lesson, in which Julie felt that she had provided an opportunity for the students to address social justice issues, the two-day lesson "Social Classes in Rome" did not include anything related to social issues. In reflecting on her teaching of this lesson, Julie stated that she initially wanted the students to touch on the unfair issues surrounding slaves, women, and gladiators in this lesson. However, when she actually taught the lesson, she chose to focus more on teaching how to find the main idea in a paragraph and write it in one's own words, because she had seen how the students had been copying words directly from the articles they received. Thus, Julie's priority in this

lesson shifted to teaching how to write a newsletter article. Julie admitted that because of this writing priority, the class didn't have the chance to talk about social justice issues, as she had anticipated (third interview, 5/19/2008). Julie also expressed the difficulty of time constraints in this lesson:

In most of the articles that the students were given, they included some issue of fairness. I definitely could have extended this issue to make the students learn about it, but that again would take up more class time... I didn't anticipate that [writing a newspaper article using their own words] would be so hard for them and demand such a long time" (e-mail reflection during her student teaching, 4/25/08).

Julie acknowledged that ethnic diversity wasn't really relevant to her unit since the focus of the unit was Ancient Roman history. But she considered the "Expansion of Rome" lesson, which was analyzed here in a previous subsection, an attempt at touching on diversity of opinions. Julie also mentioned that she taught the students that Ancient Roman slavery was not related to race, but to class (third interview, 5/19/2008). Overall, it appeared that while Julie had some ideas about addressing diversity in her unit, she was required to teach Ancient Rome history, and she could not find many social issues related to that topic to discuss.

Three things that seemed to interfere with addressing issues of diversity and social justice in Julie's teaching. During the third interview with Julie, which I conducted after she finished her student teaching practicum, it was possible for me to converse more about both her lesson plans and her actual teaching practices regarding the issues of diversity and social justice. An analysis of this conversation showed that there were three things that seemed to interfere with her ability to address the issues of diversity and social justice. The first one was "content focus and testing."

Jong-Hyun: In preparing the Ancient Rome unit, had you thought about addressing the issue of diversity and social justice?

Julie: Only indirectly. In a couple lessons I addressed it, kind of without telling the kids that I was addressing it. So I didn't make a very good connection for them, I don't think. But we did talk about things like fairness of Patricians and Plebeians...

Jong-Hyun: So when you say indirectly why you say that?

Julie: I think it was indirectly because I didn't quite tell them that this is what we're doing. Um, I think if I would have explained it, then they would have kind of understood it more. Actually, now that I think about it, I had one occasion that I explained. In my expansion lesson, the kids had to read one of eight perspectives from historical figures, and then explain to the rest of the class. And one kid just could not understand why we were doing it. He was fighting with me about, "Why are we doing this? It's so silly. I don't care what this old person says." So, I tried to explain to him that part of why I'm doing this is to make him understand someone else's perspective, and figure out where they're coming from. Because in your life, you're going to have to do that. And then he kind of got it. He still wasn't happy about it. Some kids just have bad days, but I think he understood more that I wanted him to understand a perspective that wasn't his.

Jong-Hyun: So based on your saying right now, your point or goal was to make them understand different perspectives or some issues of fairness. So, do you think the students started to think about that? Do you feel your point or goal was gotten to them?

Julie: Sometimes, in some students it was. Um, in other students, who typically struggle, I don't think they understood it, because they're just there to pass. They just want to finish it and get it out of their way, because that's how they've always been taught, and that's how they know that the system works. For some students, I think they would have gotten the big picture more often, but still I don't think it was very clear [laughing].

Jong-Hyun: I don't know for you if it was possible or not because of your student teacher situation. But, as I understand, you didn't much directly talk about your point. Why not mention it directly?

Julie: Well, because the main point of this unit was the content. And I tried to integrate things that we learned in social studies methods, but I think if I would have had my own classroom, I think I would have been a little bit more direct. Maybe have the kids understand why they should understand history. Not just "We're going to memorize this stuff and take a test on it."

Jong-Hyun: So because of maybe your situation, you had to more concern about content base—

Julie: Yeah. It was really content.

Jong-Hyun: But I saw in your lesson plans, some of your focus is understanding some different perspectives or making them thinking about fairness. You wrote those kinds of point, but because you didn't much directly talk about it, so most of the students didn't much get your point?

Julie: Probably not (third interview, 5/19/08).

As the long conversation above implies, Julie considered her particular student teaching situation as requiring her to focus primarily on the content of her unit. This seemed to be a significant constraint on her inclusion of issues of diversity and social justice. Julie mentioned this constraint in another response: "First, I had to make sure I did the content because the tests are written in advance. And we go over them and make sure that we teach what they will be tested on" (third interview, 5/19/08). It seems that the tests were an obstacle when Julie actually taught her lessons. Because Julie knew she had to prioritize teaching the content, she didn't include much direct teaching about diversity and social justice. Although a couple of her lessons were intended to address diversity and social justice, she didn't explicitly address those issues, except on one occasion when she tried to help a student understand the necessity of taking another person's perspective. After her student teaching, Julie realized that the reason why her plans to teach about diversity and social justice weren't realized was because she didn't directly explain her goals or discuss the issues with the students. Julie reflected, "I think if I would have had my own classroom, I would have been a little bit more direct. Maybe have the kids understand why

they should understand history.” Also, in another passage during the third interview, Julie confessed:

I think some of the lessons, I feel that I should have told the students, kind of at the beginning to talk about social justice, or like a intro, “This is why we’re doing this lesson this way,” and at the end, kind of sum it up. Because I think that would make it more--that would work well for students (third interview, 5/19/08).

The second obstacle was teaching Ancient Roman history as a topic. Julie had difficulty identifying social issues in the Ancient Roman curriculum. As she acknowledged, ethnic diversity wasn’t really relevant to her Ancient Rome unit. This implies that she was not able to directly transfer the various topics related to diversity presented in the methods class to ancient history. Julie expressed the difficulty of making connections with the diversity issue:

For diversity, I think it doesn’t connect to everything. Just like in any subject, you can’t force a connection. I think some of the things that we talked about in the spring that was actually called “Diversity” were very modern-day examples, and it was ethnic diversity and political diversity, and stuff like that. I think I almost had it easier, because I had the older students. I don’t know how you could connect some of this stuff in younger grades. Because they don’t know, they don’t have a background. They don’t understand the big picture. So, I don’t know how you would connect it in a lot of aspects (third interview, 5/19/08).

The third obstacle to teaching about diversity and social justice was a lack of a clear definition of social justice. Julie admitted that she did not fully understanding what social justice means. However, she acknowledged that it is related to lots of issues of fairness:

For social justice, I don’t think I understand social justice fully. So that’s hard for me to teach it, when I don’t feel that I understand totally what it means when you say, “social justice.” Um, because it’s political and economic, and lots of issues of fairness. So I think it’s hard for me because I don’t have the background knowledge always (third interview, 5/19/08).

Overall, Julie expressed that she felt it was difficult to teach diversity and social justice. However, she also believed that more experience would help her: “I think after doing more lessons, I can find ways that it would work, and it would make sense, but I think that would just come with experience” (third interview, 5/19/08).

Case 3: Emily

Section 1: Emily’s family and educational background. Emily was very different compared to the other two participants in terms of age, educational experience, and life experience. She was in her early thirties, and was the oldest of six girls in her family. She had been married once, for nine years, divorced, and remarried in 2006. She was born in the Northeastern U.S., but because of her father’s military duty she had lived in many places during her childhood. For example, she finished kindergarten in New Mexico before her family moved to Germany. She lived in Germany until the end of third grade, and then moved to Texas and later to Illinois. Her family lived in Illinois until she was a junior in high school, and then moved to North Dakota. Emily said that she didn’t like living there because she, as newcomer, knew no one. Although she completed part of her senior year in high school, she got her GED instead of graduating from high school. The following are several important experiences she had before coming to the university. These experiences are from her first interview on December 12th, 2007.

Unusual educational experience. Emily had an unusual educational experience in many ways compared to the average student who enters the teacher education program. First, Emily attended a German public school from first grade through the first half of

second grade because of her mother's desire for her to have the experience of being an outsider. Since the people in the school didn't speak any English, Emily had some language difficulties at first. However, after she eventually began to learn more German, she made lots of good friends. She said that all of her good childhood memories are related to her German friends. When Emily was asked to compare her German school and American school experiences, she responded she liked German education better. To her, it seemed that Germany supported education more than America. For example, there were more resources in the German public school, because, she claimed, more tax money was spent on schools. Emily also stated that family values were more important in Germany, with such activities as family game nights once a week in the school being common. She explained, "America's more individualistic, in my opinion, whereas [Germans are] more collective" (first interview, 12/12/2008).

After attending the German public school for one and a half years, Emily switched to the U.S. government school run by the Department of Defense in Germany until the end of third grade. Then she moved back to America and attended fourth and fifth grades in Texas and Illinois, respectively. When she moved to Illinois, she was not able to develop a good relationship with the other students, so her mom decided to home school her. She was home taught for sixth and seventh grades, and then in eighth grade she went back to public school. Instead of graduating from high school, she got a GED, and before entering university in her middle twenties, she held low-paying, minimum-wage jobs, such as cashiering at a local grocery store.

Experiences teaching children in the Mormon Church. Emily identified her experience of teaching children in the Mormon Church as a significant reason why she decided to become a teacher. In the Mormon Church, she enjoyed teaching a few different age groups—children between eighteen months to two years old, and children between four and five years old. Emily said she had always liked the little kids and enjoyed teaching them. She had especially always liked the “aha” moments when the kids realized something (first interview, 12/12/2008). She also stated that the fact that both her grandmother and two aunts were teachers helped her decision to become a teacher.

The influences of her mother toward a well-rounded worldview and a love of history. Emily mentioned her mother’s influence on her in terms of trying to instill in her a well-rounded world view and a love of history. Emily described her mother as someone who thought of herself as a “history nut,” although her mother had attended college for only two weeks. One important value that her mother always emphasized was having a “well-rounded world view.” Emily thought that her mother put her in the German Public School for this reason as well. Emily stated, “[My mother is] always telling me that there’s two sides to every story. And you’ve got to try and find the other side” (first interview, 12/12/2008).

Emily also mentioned that because of her mother’s love of history, her family visited many places that her mother thought were important. For example, while staying in Germany, her family visited many historical locations, including Dachau Concentration Camp and Anne Frank’s hideout in Amsterdam.

This experience of visiting historical places fostered her love history. Emily stated that the reason why she liked history was because she wanted to know why something happened, and then what happened as a result. Emily also said that, while she learned merely dates and names in history classes, both her mother's influence and her love of reading contributed to her understanding that history is connected to modern days.

Jong-Hyun: It seemed that you knew that history has connection to our modern times. So, how did you get that kind of idea?

Emily: I think a lot of it came from Mom, because Mom was always like, "Well, why do you think that? Why do you think they thought that way?" And so, even knowing the dates and the names, well, you're supposed to know the dates, the names, and why they're famous, but sometimes I want to know more than that. And I'm a book nut, too, so I would read almost anything I can get my hands on. And I would read the books, and they would have more than just the dates and the names. And that could be how I've made the connections, because if I just went by the textbook, textbooks are very, very dry (first interview, 12/12/2008).

Learning of social studies and issues of diversity. Overall, Emily remembered what she studied in social studies during her schooling in America very well. During grade school, she learned the basic history of states--for example, Texas history in fourth grade, and Illinois history in fifth grade. She also remembered learning about U.S. History, including the Revolutionary War and the Civil War. In her high school years, Emily took some Western European classes and two government classes.

Emily stated that during her schooling, social studies usually meant history, although she had also taken government classes. Thus, when Emily was asked to what extent, on a scale from one to five, she liked social studies, she responded, "I'd have to say five. I really like history. Maybe that's just because when I think social studies, I think history" (first interview, 12/12/2008). However, Emily confessed, she couldn't remember

learning about diversity or social justice in her schooling, except observing Black History Month.

Section 2: Influences from social studies methods course. This section analyzes the influences of the social studies methods course on Emily's understanding and learning. It is divided into two sub-sections: (a) influences on her understanding of social studies and (b) learning related to particular topics and assignments. Unlike the other two participants, the sub-section "influences related to issues of diversity and social justice" will not be provided, because the analysis of Emily's learning related to diversity and social justice is included in sub-section (a) influences on her understanding of social studies. The data sources for this analysis are mainly the first and the second interviews, her weekly response papers, and her reflection papers on class assignments.

(a) Influences on her understanding about social studies. While taking the social studies methods course, Emily indicated that she learned several important things in terms of her ideas about the subject of social studies.

Including different voices is essential. Emily clearly stated how her idea of teaching social studies changed as a result of taking the methods course.

Jong-Hyun: After taking this class, in what ways have you changed or not changed your ideas or perspectives about teaching social studies? So, maybe you need to compare before and now.

Emily: Well, that's pretty easy. Before, I just kind of thought voice was important. Now I know it's important. The different voices.

Jong-Hyun: Before, you said the voice was important?

Emily: Well, yeah, I thought "Yeah, that's important if I can fit it in." And now "it's more, I have to fit it in." It's like this. Before, "Okay, if I have extra time, I'll do this." And now it's like, "I'm going to make the time."

Jong-Hyun: So, maybe, before you just thought that voice matters. But you didn't much think about how it is important?

Emily: Yeah, I didn't think about how important it was. I just kind of thought it was important. And I've always thought, "Okay, so whose side are we presenting?" But it wasn't until afterwards that I realized, really it's not—because I took women's history—it's not just men's voices that we're hearing, it's specifically just the white men.

Jong-Hyun: So, in that sense, before you thought about that voice kind of matters, but you didn't much develop...

Emily: I thought it was more like an enrichment thing. Something to do if you have time. Um, and now I realize that it's essential. I guess that's the biggest difference. The difference between enrichment and essential (second interview, 2/14/2008).

After taking the methods course, Emily came to realize that including different voices is essential in teaching social studies. In comparing her ideas before and after the methods course, she used the words "enrichment" and "essential." Reading Takaki's book appeared to be one of main factors that made her realize the indispensability of including different voices in social studies. When Emily was asked which book or reading was most meaningful to her, she indicated Takaki's book:

I think the best book was Takaki, by far. For Takaki, it was just the other voices that I haven't really heard. I mean, I knew some of them, and I know the basic idea, but there was actually examples, and more stories. So, from Takaki, I heard other people's voices that I haven't really heard (second interview, 2/14/2008).

Also, after reading a chapter from the Takaki book, Emily wrote, "If we learn of other groups' experiences, we can expand the narrow and limited ideology that says all Americans are white middle class men (weekly response paper, 8/31/2007). In fact, Emily thought that the course objective "to realize that American history is being taught from the white perspective in the textbook and that we need to get more voices heard because America is not a white America" was very important (first interview, 12/12/2007). Emily

considered this objective to have been met in a variety of ways, especially in the Takaki book, since that book introduced her to new interpretations of history.

Emily's incorporated her new value on including different voices into her unit plan assignment for the fall semester. Because this was a group work assignment, Emily's group wrote an "Oregon Trail" unit for the fifth grade classroom. Her individual focus in this unit was on making sure Native American voices were heard. In particular, Emily wanted the students to learn about Native American tribes that lived along the Oregon Trail, including how they lived before the White settlers came, their initial reactions to them coming, and then ultimately what happened to them (second interview, 2/14/2008).

An analysis of her student teaching practices during spring semester showed that Emily tried to include different voices in her lessons. This will be discussed further in the next section when her student teaching practices are analyzed.

Purposes of social studies. Emily also confessed that her idea about the purpose of social studies changed after taking the methods course. When asked before taking the methods course why she thought students should learn social studies and what contents they should learn, Emily stated:

Social studies teaches children how to be good citizens. How to contribute to their society meaningfully... Before they can be good citizens, they have to explore where they fit in. So they're going to have to get an idea of their community. And with that, maybe a basic run-down on how the government works. They should know how the government works. And, they should probably learn about the movements that have changed history (first interview, 12/12/2007).

It was clear that even before this course, Emily already viewed one purpose of social studies as “making productive citizens.” However, her thoughts about the purposes of social studies changed after taking this course.

Emily: I still think it’s very important for social studies to make productive citizens. I still believe that. But I also believe it’s important that, along with productive citizens, you need to teach them how to address issues that aren’t necessarily fair. So I would say social justice issues because you don’t really have a good citizen unless they’re willing to go out and change what’s wrong. So. That’s probably where I differ the most, from before and after.

Jong-Hyun: Productive citizen was, even before this class, what you already thought about the purpose. But right now after this class, you also think about how to address the issue of fairness and justice, or kind of issue of social justice?

Emily: Yeah. Because I think now, they’re kind of really tied together. You can’t really teach one without the other. But I never thought about that before. I thought social justice was just something totally separate. And I didn’t think it was important, and I really thought the biggest reason for social studies was just to make good citizens (second interview, 2/14/2008).

Expanding on her previous thoughts about the purpose of social studies as “making productive citizens,” Emily’s concept evolved to connect “making productive citizens” and “social justice issues”—“you can’t teach one without the other.” Emily came to realize that the purpose of social studies was “making the society more just by providing productive citizens.” Teaching social justice was one of five conceptual frameworks for the methods course, and many social justice issues such as addressing controversial issues, practicing democracy in the classroom, and talking about economic justice were discussed in the methods course. It seemed that the course influenced Emily’s idea about the purpose of social studies. In addition, Emily’s realization that the textbook unjustly excluded the contributions of minority groups also appeared to make her think about the issue of fairness

in teaching social studies. Emily reflected, “History is written by the victor, that is why the majority of textbooks focuses on what the white men encountered and disregards the contribution of other minority groups as well as the experiences of women” (weekly response paper, 8/31/2007).

Lesson delivery is important. Emily confessed before taking the methods course that she had never concerned herself about how to deliver a social studies lesson, because history had always fascinated her. However, while taking the methods course, she realized that the delivery of the lessons was important (second interview, 2/14/2008). In short, she came to understand that in order to make her students more interested in social studies, she must be concerned about how to deliver the lessons.

In particular, Emily listed learning about different ways of delivering social studies instruction and integrating it with other subjects as one of the most useful things that she took away from the methods course. The reason for this credit was that she was actually using several methods that she had learned in the course, such as the fishbowl technique, in her student teaching classroom to get the students interested in her lessons. She realized that using varied pedagogical approaches helped engage the students.

Also, Emily began to value the subject of social studies as a jumping off point for integrating other subjects such as math and language arts. For example, she stated that when teaching about the Civil War, it would be possible to teach a math lesson about supply and demand for the Union and Confederate armies, or to teach a reading and writing lesson discussing the themes of the conflict (second interview, 2/14/2008).

An analysis of her student teaching practices during spring semester indicated that Emily actually practiced integrating social studies with other subjects and employed several different methods in order to engage the students in her lessons. The ways Emily taught her social studies lessons will be discussed in the next section when her student teaching practices are analyzed.

(b) Learning related to particular topics and assignments. This subsection analyzes particular topics and assignments that influenced Emily's learning from the social studies methods course.

Learning about the topic of White privilege. Emily said that realizing how she has benefited from being White was the most valuable thing that she learned on the topic of White privilege. During one class session, each student was asked to answer 26 yes-or-no questions about white privilege. Then the whole class discussed White privilege in American society based on the students' answers. Emily confessed, "Before, I didn't much think about the fact that I benefited because of being white. There are a lot of things that I don't worry about because I don't have to" (second interview, 2/14/2008).

Emily stated that her learning about the topic of White privilege directly influenced her student teaching practice by making her much more concerned about the feelings of the only African American student in her classroom.

Emily: We have one African American student, the rest are all whites. They were doing a unit on fairy tales, when I first got there. And I noticed all the books that were out were, all the main characters were white. And after I had the white privilege class, I went and I picked up some more fairy tales from different countries. We had an African American fairy tale, I brought in some Chinese fairy tale, just anything I could find that didn't have a white main character. Because the one little girl in our class, I really don't know much about her, but I don't think

she's all that comfortable. Maybe I think she likes the class, but I just don't think she's comfortable with her heritage, and I don't know if it's just because she's in a school that's predominantly white, in a classroom that's predominantly white, so I wanted to make sure that there was some books that represented her, that would be a direct influence (second interview, 2/14/2008).

Learning about addressing gay and lesbian issues. Emily said that learning about addressing gay and lesbian issues was another important topic to her in the methods course. During one class session in the spring semester, the students watched a video titled "It's Elementary," which showed how the GLBT issues were taught in an elementary school. Then the whole class talked about why and how the teachers addressed this issue. Emily stated that the idea that teachers should address this issue was new to her, because before, she simply thought it would probably be best if she stayed out of it (second interview, 2/14/2008).

Emily mentioned that during the class discussion, she came to understand why teachers should address this issue. One big reason that the class thought of was giving the students the opportunity to form their own informed opinions, the point being that if teachers don't teach students how to address GLBT issues correctly, the students' learning about these issues will not be based in fact. The students will just form opinions based on what they hear from other people. Another reason that the class thought of was to encourage students to value other lifestyles, the point here being that if teachers fail to address something, it implies that they don't value it. In that case, the students would presume that valuing other lifestyles is not important.

Section 3: Analyzing student teaching practices. This section focuses on analyzing Emily's student teaching practices related to her learning from the methods

course. Information about her class contexts and her cooperating teacher, and overall information about what she taught as social studies lessons will be provided first, followed by an analysis of her student teaching practices.

Class contexts and cooperating teacher, Mrs. Hall. Emily's full time student teaching placement in the spring semester was a 4th grade classroom in a rural school. Located in a small town, the school's students were predominantly White, although there was some socio-economic diversity. Emily's classroom had twenty students--nine boys and eleven girls--and one African American girl, the rest of the students being White. The class had a 30-minute social studies class every day.

Emily's cooperating teacher, Mrs. Hall, had taught at this school for three years directly after she had graduated from the teacher education program at the University of Illinois. She taught second grade her first year, and then taught fourth grade for two years. Mrs. Hall said that she had wanted to be a teacher since she was three, and when she was an adult, she realized that she was good with children. Mrs. Hall stated that as an elementary teacher, her main goals were to help her students be good people and productive members of society, and to give them a love for learning (interview with Emily's cooperating teacher, 5/22/08).

Mrs. Hall had had two student teachers during her three years of teaching, but Emily was her first full time student teacher. Mrs. Hall stated that she had student teachers in her classroom because she wanted to help foster good teachers. In particular, Mrs. Hall regarded student teaching as a time for the student teachers to try out some ideas and theories that they had learned at the university and see if they really work. She wanted the

student teachers to be exposed to as many different ideas and situations as they could during their student teaching practicum (interview with Emily's cooperating teacher, 5/22/08).

Overall information about what Emily taught as social studies lessons. Before Emily started full time student teaching in April, she intermittently taught several social studies lessons as her cooperating teacher assigned. However, I didn't have the chances to observe these lessons.

During her three weeks of full time student teaching, Emily taught a unit called "Pioneers in Illinois," which she had prepared based on the information from Chapter 6, "The Journey to Illinois," and Chapter 7, "Settling Illinois," from the class's social studies textbook. In preparing this unit, Emily did not adhere strictly to the textbook. Rather, she added her own ideas to some of the lessons. After teaching "Pioneers in Illinois," Emily also taught several lessons from Chapter 8, "A Time of Troubles." I observed most of the lessons Emily taught during her full time student teaching.

Emily's student teaching practices are organized in two sub-sections: (a) her teaching practices related to her learning from the methods class, and (b) her teaching practices related to diversity and social justice. The data sources for this analysis are mainly my field notes in observing her teaching, all three interviews, her lesson plans, and her reflection paper after student teaching.

(a) Emily's teaching practices related to her learning from the methods course.

This subsection analyzes how Emily tried to incorporate her learning from the methods

class into her student teaching practices. Her teaching practices that directly related to diversity and social justice will be discussed in the next sub-section.

Emily stated that her main goal related to social studies during her student teaching was helping the students rethink about social studies:

Emily: A lot of my students have told me, history is boring... My biggest goal out of all of student teaching was to get the students to take another look at social studies, especially since I know they had told me they hated it. And since it happens to be one of my favorite areas, I really don't understand how people can hate it. So I had to, you know, kind of address that.

Jong-Hyun: So, as I understand, kind of your goal was not making the students think social studies is boring.

Emily: Yeah, I wanted them to rethink it (third interview, 5/17/2008).

On the first day in her student teaching classroom, Emily asked the students whether they liked social studies, and only two of the nineteen students present that day answered that they liked social studies. The rest of the class responded that they really did not like it, saying that if they would prefer not to do it if they did not have to. Realizing this problem, Emily set a goal of making the students rethink the subject of social studies. An analysis of her student teaching showed that Emily incorporated several things that she had learned from the methods class, such as using family history, integrating other subjects, and employing varied teaching methods and activities into her social studies lessons, in trying to achieve her goal.

Using her husband's family history to helping the students understand that history has connection to them. Although Emily didn't have a chance to ask the students why they didn't like social studies on the first day of her placement, later, by talking with the students on the playground, she was able to learn some reasons: "Well, you just have to memorize a

lot of stuff,” “It’s just names and dates,” and “It doesn’t matter because they’re just dead people anyway.” It was apparent to Emily that the students were missing the connection between past and today when they thought about social studies, especially history (third interview, 5/17/2008).

In order to help the students understand that history is connected to them and directly affects their lives, she used actual family history from her husband’s side, instead of merely reading the textbook. As a short introductory lesson to the unit, Emily presented her husband’s family history to the class using a PowerPoint presentation titled “Moving to Illinois.” She showed a picture of her husband’s grandfather, Mr. Smith, who moved to Marshall, Illinois from Pennsylvania in the 1850’s. The next slide showed a picture of Mr. Smith inside a small one-room log cabin, with Emily’s husband’s mother as a little girl. The last two slides showed several current pictures of Mr. Smith’s old homestead, including a log cabin, the farmland where Mr. Smith farmed and raised his family, and his gravestone. While viewing these pictures, the class talked about Emily’s husband’s family history. For example, the class talked about why and how Mr. Smith, who was born in Pennsylvania, moved to Illinois. The students also talked about why they thought he had decided to locate his homestead near a small ravine. The students suggested that he moved to Illinois because he was a farmer, and there was good farmland Illinois, and that he chose the homestead location because it reminded him of Pennsylvania, where there were lots of hills (field notes, 3/31/2008).

Emily felt the students seemed engaged with this lesson about her husband’s family history, because they even said that they wanted to visit the old homestead area. Emily also

thought that this lesson provided the students an opportunity to understand history's connection to them today, since they came to realize how her husband's family's history affected her and her family today (third interview, 5/17/2008).

The use of family histories was covered in one session of the methods course in the fall semester. Emily said that she really liked learning about how we could use family history as a jumping off point, because every family is different (first interview, 12/12/2007). When she was asked what she wanted to change about this lesson, Emily answered, "If I teach this lesson again later, I would have liked to have the students' parents come in, especially if they have any family history, and to present their family history" (third interview, 5/17/2008). Emily learned about the use of family history from the methods class and incorporated it directly into her student teaching practice.

Integrating other subjects in the "Pioneers in Illinois" unit. Emily said that the methods course led her to consider the subject of social studies as a base for integrating other subjects such as math and language arts (second interview, 2/14/08). In preparing her "Pioneers in Illinois" unit, Emily actually integrated other subjects into her social studies lessons. Although she had to teach the basic content from the social studies textbook, she did not want her lessons to adhere strictly to the textbook and therefore, she included other subjects, such as writing, art, and science.

The integrated lessons in "Pioneers in Illinois" were: (a) a one week writing lesson in which the students wrote stories about pioneer life; (b) a two-day poem lesson in which the students created "Pioneer Poetry" based on a short excerpt about pioneer life; (c) a science lesson called "Making Butter" in which the students made butter and discussed the

difficulty of butter making in the pioneer days; (d) an art lesson called “Making Prayer Dolls” in which the students made the prayer dolls that pioneer children used to play with; and (e) an art lesson called “Making a Quilt” in which the students made a class quilt and discussed the fact that quilts were used for keeping warm in the pioneer days (Emily’s lesson plans from “Pioneers in Illinois” unit). Among these integrated lessons, the writing lessons and the science lesson were provided during the regular language arts and science class periods. In contrast, because the students left the classroom for an art class taught by a special art teacher, the two art lessons required extra time. Thus Emily taught the two art lessons during morning work time.

Emily integrated lessons with other subjects in the “Pioneers in Illinois” unit because she wanted to provide an opportunity for students to imagine what life was like in pioneer days compared to modern days. She wanted the students could make a connection between the past and today. Particularly, in preparing the lesson about making prayer dolls, Emily had two purposes. One was to teach the students that pioneers weren’t all adults. Emily regarded this connection as significant, since she realized that the kids’ lives in pioneer days were not often presented as a topic in the textbook, except as regards pioneer schools. The other purpose was to teach the students what kind of toys the pioneer children might have played with. With the prayer doll lesson, Emily wanted the students to compare their lives and the lives of pioneer kids (third interview, 5/17/08).

Later, when the class took a field trip to Springfield in May, Emily happened to find that the experience of making the prayer dolls had made an impression on the students. Although Emily’s official full time student teaching was done, she went on this field trip

with the students. During the trip, Emily heard the students talking about prayer dolls on two occasions. Once was when the students saw a prayer doll in the museum and said, “That’s just like the doll we made!” The other occasion was when the students went to Lincoln’s tomb. They were talking about where Lincoln lived, and someone said that he lived in a log cabin. Another student remarked, “I wonder if he ever made a prayer doll for his little sister.” It was apparent to Emily that the students were still thinking of the dolls even a month after the lesson (third interview, 5/17/08).

Emily also reported an interesting story regarding how the students had changed their responses toward these integrated lessons in the “Pioneers in Illinois” unit. For some of these integrated lessons during first week of the unit, she explicitly announced the connection between social studies and the lessons in order for the students to understand why they were having the lessons. For instance, before having the art lesson “Making Prayer Dolls,” Emily introduced, “Now we’re going to make a toy that the pioneer kids would have had, or played with.” Also, before starting the art lesson “Making a Quilt,” she initiated a discussion about how the pioneers stayed warm.

Emily said that the students complained about having too many social studies lessons at the beginning of the unit. When they had writing lessons about pioneer life, they said, “Oh, we’re doing social studies again? Oh, man!” Getting this negative response from the students, Emily explained, “In life, things are not separate. You don’t have just social studies and just writing and just science. They all kind of mingle together.” After she explained this, the students’ responses changed. They began to say, “Oh, it’s social studies and writing again,” or “Oh, it’s social studies and science.” Thus, Emily didn’t have to

mention the connection between social studies and the other subjects again. Later, there was one occasion in which the students actually made the connection themselves. Three spelling words one week just happened to be “wagon,” “candle,” and “quilt.” Upon hearing these spelling words, the students made the connection, asking Emily, “Oh, did you make up these spelling words because we’re doing pioneers?” It was really interesting for Emily to see the students making connections between the social studies lessons and the spelling words themselves (third interview, 5/17/08). One of conceptual frameworks for the methods class was “employing integration to facilitate learning,” and Emily’s focus on integration was apparent when she planned her unit.

Employing varied teaching methods and activities. Emily said that while taking the methods course, she had come to realize that she must be concerned about how to deliver her social studies lessons in order to engage the students more fully in the lessons (second interview, 2/14/08). It appeared that this realization influenced Emily’s preparation of her social studies lessons. Emily didn’t make the students merely read the social studies textbook in her social studies lessons. Instead, she employed varied teaching methods and activities.

Some examples of the different teaching methods and activities Emily employed to engage the students in her social studies lessons were: (a) a “Moving Activity Game” addressing the topics of why and how the Pioneers moved from the East to Illinois; (b) a “Mini-Simulation for One-Room Schoolhouse” teaching how the schools in pioneers days differed from modern-day schools; (c) a “Making Immigrant Advertisement Poster Activity” addressing the topics of why and how immigrants from European countries came

to America in the 1850s; (d) “Having Group Debates” teaching why canals and railroads were built in Illinois and which one was better for the economy; (e) “Planning the Students’ Own Trip” teaching where the railroads of Illinois were built; (f) “Making the Students’ Immigrant Shield Activity,” addressing the topics of what the students’ family values were and what their cultural heritage was; and (g) “Using Trade Books” in teaching the “Black Hawk War” and “Slavery” lessons (Emily’s lesson plans). Among these examples, both (f) “Making the Students’ Immigrant Shield Activity” and (g) “Using Trade Books” will be discussed in more detail in the next sub-section during the analysis of Emily’s teaching practices related to the issue of diversity.

In the following paragraphs, more detailed information about two methods—(a) the “Moving Activity Game” and (b) the “Mini-Simulation for One-Room Schoolhouse”—is provided since Emily felt that these two were more successful than the other methods. Emily adapted the “Moving to Illinois Game” from the Oregon Trail game. Right after Emily had shared her husband’s family story as the introductory lesson for “Pioneers in Illinois”, she played this game for the students to learn about what the pioneers had to do in order to move to Illinois. Using a map and a die, each group was asked to move around the classroom and to go up the stairs in the hallway to perform certain activities that the pioneers might have done as they moved to Illinois. For example, a group was asked to fight with Native Americans using imaginary bows and arrows. On another occasion, a group had to pretend to dig a grave and bury a dead body, because someone had died while moving to Illinois. And on yet another occasion, a group had to pretend to climb the Appalachian Mountains by going up the stairs in the hallway. After this game, the class

discussed several questions, such as “Why did people want to move?” and “How difficult was the trip?” Emily’s main purpose was to help the students realize that there were many difficulties the pioneers might have encountered as they moved to Illinois. Emily thought the students really enjoyed the game. The only thing Emily wanted to change if she did it again was allow them to form “families” and come up with a new last name (Emily’s reflection paper about this lesson).

Emily regarded the “Mini-Simulation of a One-Room Schoolhouse” as the students’ favorite teaching method. Instead of merely reading the paragraphs from the textbook about pioneer schools, Emily used a mini-simulation. She set up the classroom like a one-room pioneer schoolhouse. The boys sat on one side, and the girls sat on the other. The two rules that the students had to follow during this lesson were written on the chalkboard: stand up when giving answers, and reply with a “Yes, ma’am” or “No, ma’am.” She had a big yardstick and slapped it on the desk a couple times, and also stood someone in the corner with a dunce’s hat. Later, the class talked about whether they agreed with the idea of the one-room schoolhouse, as some people today want to return to schools where different grades share the same classroom. One White girl said, “I disagree with that idea, because it is difficult for teachers to teach if they have different grades in one classroom.” In contrast, one African American girl said, “I agree with that idea, since I could help my little brother if we were in one classroom.” Emily applauded both answers, saying, “I think both of your answers are valid” (fieldnotes, 4/7/08).

Emily felt that the students really enjoyed this mini-simulation. She mentioned that during the rest of her full time student teaching, the students often requested that she be the

“mean” teacher again. Emily thought that this lesson stuck with the students because they actually had a simulation instead of learning the information by reading the textbook. Emily also said that through this simulation, the students understood that history wasn’t really just about dead people. One thing Emily wanted to change if she did this simulation again later was that she might ask a parent to volunteer to be the teacher, because she had a hard time keeping in the character of a strict teacher (third interview, 5/17/08). During the methods class, there was one occasion that the class did a mini-simulation in which only one person in a group of ten had seven of the ten Kit-Kat bars available to that group. Then the class discussed the issue of economic inequality among the countries of the world. This simulation may have influenced Emily to use a simulation for this lesson.

Students’ reactions to Emily’s teaching of social studies. Overall, Emily thought that her efforts to make the students rethink social studies throughout her student teaching were successful at least to some degree. She mentioned two stories related to this.

Emily: The first day I was there, I asked them how many people like social studies, and they were like, “Ugh.” And, you know, yesterday, Mrs. Hall [Emily’s cooperating teacher] said that they were lining up to get drinks right before social studies, and they said, “Yeah! It’s time for social studies! It’s so much fun!” I don’t know that that kind of hurt Mrs. Hall’s feelings, but she said, “I thought you’d like to know.” Apparently, they’re enjoying it, which is it’s good for me (second interview, 2/14/08).

Emily: Well, it was really funny, I went to Springfield on the fieldtrip on the Tuesday. All of the kids, “Oh, Mrs. Fredrickson, this is so cool! This is so much more fun than social studies!” And then, Cambry, she says, “Not that your social studies lessons weren’t fun, but this so cool!” So, it was just because the difference, of course, of going on a field trip versus staying in the classroom (third interview, 5/17/08).

Emily thought that she provided an opportunity for the students to rethink social studies. However, she also acknowledged the fact that she could not force the students to love social studies.

Emily: You know, there are some kids who rethought it, and they still don't like it that much. But they did rethink it. And that's really, probably the biggest thing I wanted was them to have a--I would prefer for them all to love it, but, you know, you just can't force that on kids. But they did say, "Well, it's still boring, but it's not as boring as it was." So, I guess that's okay (third interview, 5/17/08).

(b) Emily's teaching practices related to diversity and social justice. This subsection focuses on analyzing Emily's teaching related to diversity and social justice, and describes her thoughts about teaching diversity and social justice after her student teaching practicum.

In addition to her biggest goal of making the students rethink the subject of social studies, both addressing diversity and including different voices were major concerns for Emily in planning her social studies lessons. For example, when Emily was asked about her main objective when preparing her "Pioneers in Illinois" unit, she answered:

I wanted them to really understand the different people who came, the different reasons for moving to Illinois, just to get a general sense that not everyone in Illinois was the same, basically that they were diverse. Because there were a lot of people who were strict abolitionists, there were plenty from the South who thought slavery should be fine, and then there were those in-between who thought slavery was wrong... I wanted them to have a good solid background to see why Illinois was so diverse, to see how the split came about in Illinois during the Civil War (third interview, 5/17/08).

Emily's main objective in preparing "Pioneers in Illinois" was making the students understand how different people came to Illinois for different reasons in pioneer days. Also,

in response to my question about which concept or perspective from the methods class she had tried to incorporate into her student teaching, Emily stated:

I think the thing is, the biggest thing I pulled out of the course was the multiple perspectives, different voices. And how you need to address them. And I tried to do that (third interview, 5/17/08).

In the following paragraphs, three lessons are analyzed in terms of how Emily tried to address the issues of diversity and different voices in her teaching of social studies.

Including the perspective of Native Americans in the “Black Hawk War” lesson.

Emily stated that because she realized that the social studies textbook was predominantly written from the perspective of white European settlers, she decided to include different voices, such as black pioneers and Native Americans, in her unit “Pioneers in Illinois” (third interview, 5/17/08).

Distributing handouts to the students, Emily said, “It’s two sides. The title is ‘Black Hawk Campaign.’ It is just the outline. You are going to fill in the outline.” Showing the PowerPoint title page to the students, Emily said, “You see a wonderful picture of a Native American. His name is Chief Black Hawk. Today we will learn about the Black Hawk War, and I decided we’re going to look first at what Chief Black Hawk had stated about the war. We will talk about it and then come back the textbook. Before talking about the war, we’ll talk a little bit about how Native Americans kind of felt they’d been cheated.” Then, Emily talked about how the American government had used alcohol, clothing, and money to make treaties with Native American Tribes. Showing the next slide to the students, Emily said, “First, I want to talk about how tension mounts. Somebody signed a treaty that gave all the land to the U.S. government. So, who do you think that somebody is? Sam, who is that somebody?” But Sam did not answer. Emily said again, “Remember the Native Americans were giving their own lands. So?” One White girl said, “Black Hawk.” Emily responded, “That’s a very good guess, but actually it was a sub-chief. So, on the blank of first line, write “4 sub-chiefs and the year 1812.” Emily continued to talk about how the American government and the Sauk Indians had stayed peaceful until 1831, because the American government allowed the Indians to build their trading post and stay on the land. Emily said, “But, in 1831, something happened. Who wants to read what happened?” One White boy read from the PowerPoint, “1831, move out within 30 days or you will be driven

out by bullets.” Emily continued, “So, American Father, the president, says, ‘you guys have 30 days to move out, or we’re going to shoot you.’ What do you think the Native Americans thought about this? How would you feel if you’re living on some lands forever, your parents, your grandparents were living on these lands, now some people come to say, ‘move in 30 days or you will be gone.’ What do you think?” One white boy answered, “I would fight for the land.” Emily responded, “O.K. You’re going to protect yourself.” Then Emily continued to read the PowerPoint: “So, in 1831, 2,000 soldiers marched to one little Native American village to get them out. One evening, they left in such a hurry that they were unable to harvest their crops, so their corn crop was in the field, they didn’t have time to pack a majority of their belongings. They went to Iowa” (fieldnotes, 4/4/08).

As the vignette above shows, when Emily taught about the Black Hawk War, she included the perspective of the Native Americans. Instead of teaching the information directly from the textbook for this lesson, Emily taught the students the information that she got from a trade book titled “*Black Hawk: Indian patriot*” by LaVere (1972), using a PowerPoint presentation. After this presentation, the class talked about the information from textbook.

There were several differences between the information Emily presented from the Black Hawk biography book and the information from the social studies textbook. In particular, Emily emphasized two details that the textbook didn’t mention. The first was related to the story of why the war occurred. Based on the information from the book “Black Hawk: Indian Patriot,” when the Sauk Indians saw the U.S. troops, Black Hawk realized he could not fight such an army. Thus, he sent some braves with a white flag to the American soldiers’ camp to indicate surrender. However, the inexperienced U.S. troops killed the two truce bearers, which provoked the war. It might be said that Black Hawk did not initially want to go to war, but the textbook did not mention this at all.

The second detail missing from the textbook was the fact that the American soldiers shot at the women and children trying to swim to safety. Near the end of the war, realizing that he could not win, Black Hawk tried to surrender again, as the Indians were trying to cross the Mississippi River into Iowa. Although the Indians had a white flag again, an American army steamer fired three rounds of cannon fire at the Indians, killing 23 of them. The American army returned the next day and shot at the women and children trying to swim to safety while the Indian men tried to fight back. After telling this story, Emily asked the students, “Was it right that they were shooting at the women and children trying to swim across the river?” (fieldnotes, 4/4/08). Emily’s intention here was to address social justice issues (third interview, 5/1/7/08). The information about the shooting of women and children by US soldiers was not mentioned in the social studies textbook.

Emily stated that her main reason for including the Native American perspective in teaching the “Black Hawk War” lesson was to show that history is seen differently depending on your point of view and what you choose to tell.

Emily: We did have the Native Americans in the Black Hawk War. We talked about the version that was in his biography. That’s what we started out with. And then we went back and we looked at the version that was in the textbook, and there were some similarities, but there were also some glaring differences, and we talked about why do you think they’re different?

Jong-Hyun: So, what was your point when you taught the Black Hawk war?

Emily: The point of it was because I wanted them to get both sides. I could have gone straight, just from the textbook and covered just what they needed to know with it. But I wanted them to understand that history is seen differently—I mean, it’s the same exact event, but depending on who you were, it’s going to be seen differently. So all of the stuff on my PowerPoint slides was information that I got from his biography. And we talked just about this, and I said, “So, did this was really happen?” And they said, “Yes.” And so then I said, “Well, all right. Well,

here's another look at it." And I read it, and it was different. And I said, "So is this what really happened?" And they're like, "No, it was the first one." And I think it was just because I had read it to them first, that that's why they thought that. And I said, "Well, actually, both of them are what really happened. It just depends on your point of view" (third interview, 5/17/08).

Emily also mentioned that on another occasion besides the "Black Hawk War" lesson, she tried to help the students understand that "history is just someone's interpretation of what happened."

Emily: I wanted them to understand that history is just someone's interpretation of what happened. This is not the final end-all be-all interpretation of what happened. We even talked about, um, I gave them a scenario about me and my sisters getting into a fight. And I went down and told my dad, "This is what happened." My sister went down and told my dad, "This is what happened." My other sister went down and told him "This is what happened." And we talked, "Okay, now who was telling the truth?" "What really happened?" And they're like, "I don't know" (third interview, 5/17/08).

Using a trade book in the "Slavery" lesson. In teaching the topic "Slavery" from Chapter 8, "A Time of Troubles," Emily again used a trade book in addition to the social studies textbook.

Emily had the students sit as a circle on the rug, which was in a back corner of the classroom. Sitting on a chair in the circle, Emily told the students, "We're going to learn a little about Frederick Douglass. We'll read the book *Frederick Douglass: The Last Day of Slavery*." She started to read the book: "Frederick Douglass was born as a slave. He never knew his father and saw his mother only few times..." While reading, Emily sometimes stopped to comment or show illustrations to the students. For instance, after reading the line, "Frederick liked to be alone reading on the grass," Emily said, "this is very unusual that Frederick knew how to read, as most slaves didn't." On another occasion, after reading the line, "This is him beaten by a cattle whip," Emily showed the illustration to the class. All of the students seemed to listen attentively to the story. After finishing the book, Emily read a short biography of Frederick Douglass. Emily read, "He was born 1817. He never knew who his father was. He saw his mom few times. He was taught to read

by his master's wife. He escaped in 1838 to the North for freedom. He wrote a book. He became a leader of the abolitionist movement. He wrote more volumes of his autobiography. In his later years he continued to struggle for freedom, until he died in 1895." Then Emily asked the students, "So, he is a real person, and really what happened? How do you feel? Any questions?" One student asked, "Did he die as a slave?" Emily answered, "No, he died as a free man." (fieldnotes, 4/23/08).

As the vignette above shows, Emily presented the story *Frederick Douglass: The last day of slavery* by Miller and Lucas (1996) before the students started to study the information from the textbook. The basic content of this trade book is the story of Frederick Douglass, who was born as a slave and became a leader of the abolitionist movement. After listening to this story, the class came back to the textbook. Then the whole class talked about several things related to the topic of slavery. For example, Emily asked the class, "Do you think that it's a good thing that we've gotten rid of slavery? Raise your hands if you think so." The students answered, "Yes!" while raising their hands. Also, a white boy asked, "Are there any places that still have slavery?" Emily answered, "No, not in the United States. There are some in foreign countries, but I don't remember which ones they are. And a white girl asked, "If the owner didn't want Frederick to read, why did his wife teach him to read?" Emily responded, "His wife wanted him to read. Sometimes women do things behind their husbands' backs—the things that they don't agree with" (fieldnotes, 4/23/08).

Emily stated that the main point of her slavery lesson was to help the students get more than one perspective on the topic slavery. In particular, in telling the story of Frederick Douglass, she described two purposes. One was to provide a slave's point of view, because she thought that it is rare to hear from the point of view of the slave, while it is easy to hear the perspective of the North or the South. The other purpose was to help the

students understand that there were people who owned slaves but cared for their welfare, like the wife of Fredrick's master. Emily wanted the students learn that not all people who owned slaves were horrible to them.

Jong-Hyun: So, when you taught about slavery, what was your point?

Emily: About the slavery, it's so easy just to hear the Northern or the Southern side. And it's very rare, I think, that you don't hear anyone else's. I mean like the slavery point of view, although they do have some now... So I thought the story of Frederick Douglass. I read to them. I thought that would help. It illustrated both, really, the good and the bad. It had in there that, he was, of course, beaten and everything, but someone did teach him how to read... I just wanted them to get some more than just the one perspective. I mean, I wanted them to understand that it was evil and it was bad and it didn't help, but I wanted them also to understand that even though there were people who owned slaves, some of them did actually think about the welfare of their slaves. And the women who did in Frederick Douglass case, was powerful... I think that there's a lot of times when all the kids, especially in the North, get bombarded with just all the bad things, and that everyone who ever owned slaves was horrible, and they didn't really care, and they liked to stand around and watch them get beatings. I don't know if that's true or not, because I wasn't there, but I don't think it would be. You know, if you had people that were willing to risk their lives to help you run away, to get you medicine, to help you read... I mean, they couldn't have all been horrible. I'm not saying they were all great, either. But they weren't all horrible (third interview, 5/17/08).

Using a trade book in the slavery lesson captured the students' interest, thus making them eager to learn more about the topic of slavery. When Emily was asked what she thought the students learned from the slavery lesson, she responded:

I don't know what they learned from the slavery issue. I know they were really interested in it, and they wanted to learn more, which is always number one for me if the students actually go out on their own and look up the information, because that means they actually want to learn, and wanting to learn is a big part of learning, at least for me. They actually, a lot of them went out and read more about it and shared books. "Oh, Miss Fredrickson, we need to read this, it's a really good book." So, I don't know exactly what they learned about it, but they wanted to learn more (third interview, 5/17/08).

Making the students' immigrant shield activity. One lesson in the "Pioneers in Illinois" unit was making the students' immigrant shield. Prior to this lesson, the students completed their family inventories as homework. Some examples of the questions from the family inventory were: "What are some things your family likes to do for fun?" "What are some of your family's favorite meals, foods, or restaurants?" "What are some things your family believes in or finds important?" and "What country or countries are your ancestors from?" By completing this family inventory, Emily wanted the students to think about the things that are important to their family and what their heritage is.

Before the students made their shields, Emily showed the immigrant shield made by Mrs. Hall, her cooperating teacher, as an example. Emily explained why Mrs. Hall had used certain drawings and symbols on her shield. For example, Emily pointed out that Mrs. Hall had drawn a picture of games, because her family likes to play games for fun, and she'd drawn the flag of Germany, because her ancestors came from Germany. One white girl said, "My dad's ancestors from England, and my mom's ancestors are from Germany." Emily responded, "You can use both of them if you want. You don't have to pick just one heritage." After this explanation, Emily asked the students to start making their immigrant shields. The students were required to include a minimum of six drawings on their shields using information from their family inventories. While making their shields, the students talked to each other about which countries their ancestors were from. Also, many students looked up the flags of their ancestors' countries in the encyclopedia. The students were really concerned about drawing the flags of their ancestors' countries on their shields. Realizing this, Emily drew the flags of several countries, such as Ireland, Italy, Germany,

Britain, and Sweden, on the board, so that the students could copy from them (fieldnotes, 4/11/08).

Emily demonstrated in this lesson that she could facilitate opportunities for discussing diversity. It appeared that the students were really concerned about the flags of their ancestors' countries. The activity also showed the students that their ancestors' countries were diverse, including Ireland, Italy, England, Germany, Sweden, Mexico, and Spain. I thought that Emily could have mentioned to the students that although all of the students were White except the one African-American girl, their ancestors came from many different countries. She could have initiated discussion about diversity issues, such as how America consists of immigrant people or how diverse American society is. I anticipated that Emily might initiate some discussion about diversity issues after she mentioned to the students that their ancestors came from diverse countries, but this didn't happen. Later, during the third interview, I talked with Emily regarding her reflection about this activity.

Jong-Hyun: Talking about making immigrant shield activity, at that time, I thought that you might talk about diversity issues after the students finished that activity, or...

Emily: Yeah, I probably should have. I don't know why I didn't. But it was amazing how many different countries were represented in our little bitty tiny classroom.

Jong-Hyun: Yeah, even though they are white Caucasians except only one student, their ancestors' countries are very different. So I don't know whether they realized about how diverse their ancestors' countries were.

Emily: Well, what's funny is, I think now, it's not really a big deal. But I know back then it was a major difference. And maybe I should have brought that up how that was. How, back in the eighteen thirties, or whatever, it was a big difference to be...

Jong-Hyun: Yeah, or maybe—it's very hard too, but making each student do survey or research about their family background.

Emily: Yeah. I really—I don't know. I would have liked to, but with that wax museum research we were doing at the same time it would have been overload. And I think that's one of the hard things as a student teacher, is you have to think of everything else that's already going on. You can't—I mean, they say, "Okay, it's your classroom for three weeks," but it's really not. Because you still have to do what's outlined in the class, you know. Which I imagine when you get your own class, you're going to have things that have to be done, regardless, but you have more say, I guess, is the thing. You really have more say. But, I don't know.

Jong-Hyun: So it sounds like to me there were two matters here. One was, you yourself didn't much think of talking about how diverse their ancestors were after finishing the immigrant shield making...

Emily: Yeah.

Jong-Hyun: And the other thing is, also, you had kind of time pressure, as a student teacher. You needed to follow the already set-up time line...

Emily: Yeah. Um, when I planned the unit, Ms. Hall [Emily's cooperating teacher] was like, "Okay, you have ten days to do this," and so I was like, "Okay." But, when I taught it took longer (their interview, 5/17/08).

Emily acknowledged that in the immigrant shield activity, she missed an opportunity to address diversity. She knew that in finishing this lesson, she should have mentioned to the students how diverse their ancestors' countries were, or that she should have taught how different ethnic groups had come to America. In short, Emily admitted that she did not think much about addressing the issue of diversity when she was teaching this lesson. Emily said that one of her biggest goals during her student teaching was addressing the issue of diversity (third interview, 5/17/08). Why did she overlook the opportunity to address diversity in this lesson? There are at least two possible reasons. One reason was the fact that Emily was a beginning teacher. Like most beginning teachers, Emily relied on her prepared lesson plan, and was not able to think on her feet to utilize the diverse results of the students' research. The main objective of this lesson was that "the students will learn to

interpret family values and their heritage” (Emily’s lesson plan of this lesson). It appeared that in preparing this lesson, she didn’t think about addressing the issue of diversity and/or she didn’t anticipate how many different countries would be represented by the students’ ancestors. If Emily had been an experienced teacher, she might have responded to this opportunity to talk about the issue of diversity. The other reason why Emily may have overlooked this opportunity was, as she described, the fact that as a student teacher, she had to follow a preexisting schedule. Emily felt pressured to complete certain lessons on certain days. This feeling may have prevented her from addressing the issue of diversity.

One difficulty Emily confronted when she planned to include diverse voices in her “Pioneers in Illinois” unit. During the third interview with Emily, which I conducted after she had finished her student teaching practicum, Emily confessed that she had had difficulty finding primary sources when she was planning to include diverse voices in her “Pioneers in Illinois” unit. Because Emily knew that the social studies textbook was predominantly written from the perspective of white European settlers, she wanted to include different voices, such as black pioneers or Native Americans (third interview, 5/17/08). However, she could only include the Native American perspective, because she couldn’t find any primary sources related to black pioneers.

Emily: I couldn’t find anything about pioneers in that time frame that were different diversities. Maybe I just didn’t look hard enough, I’m not sure. Um, but we did have the Native Americans in there.

Jong-Hyun: So you mean, you talked about the diversity issue in your unit. But, you had difficulty of finding—

Emily: Primary sources. I couldn't find the primary sources. And that's maybe, that's just me, but I would really like to use primary sources. And, I didn't want to over-generalize, because I'm really not sure about Illinois history.

Jong-Hyun: Where did you try to find about the resources?

Emily: Well, um, a lot of it, I went to the local Library here. Also, I went to the U of I, and they might have had things, but I couldn't get them, because they were already checked out. Or something. It was generally gone.

Jong-Hyun: How about searching website, did you also search the website?

Emily: Yeah, and some of them, like, especially since I was focusing primarily on Illinois, that kind of limited a lot of it. For some odd reason, they don't have a lot of stuff about Illinois online. Um, especially not multiple perspectives online. There just doesn't seem to be as much about it. I'm hoping, eventually, more will come up, but—

Jong-Hyun: But you know, maybe it's not specifically Illinois history, but there's a website, Rethinking Schools dot org.

Emily: Yeah, Rethinking Schools. I heard about it, and I didn't go there, because I was always, "Has to be Illinois." They might have had more ideas, yeah. I didn't think about that.

Jong-Hyun: because, as I know, Rethinking School dot org, they started in Illinois or Chicago area, so maybe they have some useful resources for—

Emily: Yeah. Well, when I typed into the search engine, they didn't come up, that's all I know. So. I'll have to look (third interview, 5/17/08).

When Emily planned to include different voices other than that of white Europeans, it was difficult than she had anticipated for her to find useful primary resources.

Jong-Hyun: After finishing your student teaching, have you changed your perspective in addressing the issue of diversity or social justice?

Emily: I just found is, it's going to be harder to do that I originally thought. I just have realized how difficult it's going to be. Especially finding the resources (third interview, 5/17/08).

Chapter 6

Cross-Case Analysis

As summary of the findings from each three participants, this chapter provides a cross-case analysis. In particular, two charts will summarize the analysis related to the two research questions—(a) What are the influences of the social studies methods course on preservice teachers' understanding?; and (b) How do preservice teachers incorporate their learning from the social studies methods course into their actual student teaching of social studies? A more detailed description of each chart will follow, in order to highlight the similarities and the differences among three cases.

Summary of Influences from Social Studies Methods Course

Figure 4 sums up the analysis of the first research question: what are the influences of the social studies methods course on preservice teachers' understanding? This summary has been divided into three categories, reflecting the three sub-research questions: influences on understanding about social studies, the most valuable thing that each participant identified as having learned from the methods course, and influences on issues of diversity and social justice.

	Susanna	Julie	Emily
Influences on understandings of social studies—purpose, value, pedagogical recognition, and scope	<p>(a) Purpose of social studies—importance of history and learning to be good citizens</p> <p>(b) Value of social studies—goal is good citizens</p> <p>(c) Pedagogical recognition—social studies should be more than “memorizing facts”</p> <p>(d) Scope of social studies—broader sense of what is included</p>	<p>(a) Purpose of social studies—broaden students’ perspectives about the world and how they impact it</p> <p>(b) Value of social studies—goal is critical thinkers</p> <p>(c) Pedagogical recognition—integration can be used to make social studies more meaningful</p> <p>(d) Scope of social studies—broader sense of what is included</p>	<p>(a) Purpose of social studies—productive citizens and a more just society</p> <p>(b) Value of social studies—social studies as “jumping off point” for integration</p> <p>(c) Pedagogical recognition—pedagogy can increase students’ interest</p> <p>(d) Scope of social studies—no data available</p>
The most valuable thing that each participant learned	Realized the importance of knowing “accurate” information about historical events	Realized the necessity of multiple perspectives in teaching social studies	Realized how she has benefited from being White
Influences on issues of diversity and social justice	<p>(a) Diversity—diversity is recognized in the classroom but relating it primarily to cultural differences</p> <p>(b) Social justice— did not address issues of social justice</p>	<p>(a) Diversity—diversity encompasses more than racial differences</p> <p>(b) Social justice— increased understanding of equity issues</p>	<p>(a) Diversity—it is essential to include different voices in teaching social studies</p> <p>(b) Social justice— increased sense that social justice should be a focus of social studies</p>

Figure 4. Summary of influences from social studies methods course.

More detailed summaries for each case follow, and then comparisons among the three cases will be discussed in order to show the similarities and the differences among them.

Summary of Susanna’s learning from the methods course. Susanna clearly showed a new understanding of social studies from taking the methods course. First, Susanna developed her thoughts about the purpose of social studies. Before taking the methods course, she simply used to think that it was important to learn about history and government, without reflecting on the purpose of social studies. However, after taking the methods course, she recognized two purposes for teaching students social studies—“being knowledgeable about the nation’s history,” and “knowing how to be a good citizen.” Her first purpose, being knowledgeable about the nation’s history, is not much different from her previous thought that it is important to learn history. But, her second purpose, knowing how to be a good citizen, is certainly a new purpose that she developed by taking the methods course.

Second, Susanna attached a greater value to social studies. Before taking the methods course, Susanna didn’t have many feelings about teaching social studies, and didn’t feel confident in teaching it. After the course, Susanna believed that social studies is very important in helping students to become good citizens. Susanna also expressed her desire to spend more time on teaching social studies. Third, Susanna had a new pedagogical recognition in teaching social studies. Before the methods course, based on her own experience as a student, she thought social studies was simply “fact memorization” about history and government; thus it was “boring.” She developed the new understanding that

social studies includes not merely facts and memorization, but also learning about other cultures and diversity. Coupled with her broadened understanding of the scope of social studies, this new understanding about the pedagogy of social studies gave her the opinion that social studies can be fun. Fourth, Susanna developed a broadened scope about what is included in social studies. Before the methods course she regarded social studies as merely learning about history, government, and geography, based on her own social studies experiences in K-12 schooling. The methods course showed her that social studies is an umbrella term encompassing many different concepts and subjects.

Susanna identified the alternative historical narratives about Christopher Columbus as the most valuable thing that she had learned from the methods course, because it made her realize the importance of learning more information or other interpretations of historical events in order to teach children well. However, it appeared that Susanna missed the main point of the discussion in the methods course. The main point of this session was an understanding that there are multiple interpretations of historical events.

While she clearly developed a new concept of diversity, she didn't mention anything in particular that she had learned related to social justice. Susanna came to realize the situation of diverse students in the classroom after the methods course talked about bilingual and ESL students. She also expanded her understanding of diversity as related to different cultures, not solely race, and came to think that one important role for teachers is to help students become aware of other cultures and accept them. In contrast, Susanna did not develop her concept of social justice, and she did not mention anything she had learned related to social justice. When she was asked to explain her idea of social justice, she had

difficulty explaining it. After I mentioned economic issues, she only talked about economically related situations, such as a homeless shelter. Although Susanna read Compton-Lilly's (2004) "Critical Literacy Project" which was related to social justice issues and presented ways to change the students' communities, she didn't connect this with the concept of social justice. Also, Susanna wrote up her plans for "building a democratic classroom community" as her final assignment for the spring semester, but she didn't show any evidence that she understood that building a democratic community was an integral part of a socially just society.

Summary of Julie's learning from the methods course. Like Susanna, Julie also showed several new understandings about social studies from the methods course. First, Julie developed her thoughts about the purpose of social studies. Before taking the methods course, Julie thought of the purpose of social studies as history-based, saying "history is important since it can repeat itself, and you should learn how our country has been formed." However, after taking the methods course, she thought about the purpose of social studies in relation to society and world. She stated two reasons in particular why students need to learn social studies—"to broaden students' perspectives about the world," and "to find students' place in the world and to figure out how they impact the world." These purposes imply that students need to understand they are members of society and community and that they can develop their community.

Second, while taking the methods course, Julie came to acknowledge the value of social studies for helping students become critical thinkers. Julie said that discussing multiple perspectives in the methods course was a big factor that helped her realize the

value of critical thinking in social studies. Julie also said that acknowledging the value of critical thinking in social studies made her feel a responsibility to her students in teaching social studies. Third, Julie realized the necessity of integration with other subjects in order to make social studies meaningful for students, instead of merely reading social studies textbooks. Fourth, Julie expanded her concept about what disciplines are included in social studies. Before the methods course, she regarded social studies as primarily history. After the methods course, Julie understood that social studies included many disciplines, including politics, economics, sociology, and anthropology, and she came to see social studies as multidimensional, including culture, art, and music.

Julie identified learning about the necessity of multiple perspectives in teaching social studies as the most valuable thing that she had learned from the methods course. Julie clearly recalled several class sessions in which the class addressed the concept of multiple perspectives. Particularly, Julie credited reading Takaki's book as a big influence on her thinking about multiple perspectives. It made her realize how little history she knew and that history has many more perspectives than just that of white males. Julie explained that one primary focus in her social studies lessons later would be multiple perspectives, because she knew that no matter what she taught, she could incorporate multiple perspectives as a concept into her lessons.

Julie showed new recognitions of both issues of diversity and social justice from taking the methods course. Before the methods course, Julie primarily thought of diversity as being related to racial differences. Julie admitted that from the methods course she learned that there are other forms of diversity, such as sexual orientation and language

differences. After the class, Julie was more aware that diversity was a huge concept, encompassing a lot of things rather than simply racial differences. Related to social justice, Julie came to understand the inequity of women in American history from creating a unit on this topic. While creating this unit, Julie recognized that women are not well represented in history books. This recognition motivated Julie to be more concerned about inequities in American history.

Summary of Emily's learning from the methods course. While taking the methods course, Emily learned several important things in terms of her understanding about the subject social studies. First, Emily changed her idea of the purpose of social studies. Before the methods course, Emily thought that the purpose of social studies was “making productive citizens.” After the methods course, she expanded her concept of “making productive citizens” to include social justice issues. In short, Emily came to think that the purpose of social studies was “making society more just by providing productive citizens.”

Second, Emily began to value the subject of social studies as a base or as a jumping off point that can be integrated with other subjects such as math and language arts. For example, she stated that in teaching about the Civil War, it would be possible to teach math through supply and demand for the armies, and also to teach a reading and writing lesson by discussing the theme of conflict. Third, before taking the methods course, Emily had never thought about how to deliver social studies lessons, because history had always fascinated her. However, while taking the methods course, she came to realize that the delivery of lessons was important to capture students' interest. She said that learning

different ways of delivering social studies instruction was one of most useful things she had learned from the methods course.

Emily identified white privilege as the most valuable thing that she had learned from the methods course. Emily confessed that through that class session, she came to realize how she has benefited from being white. Before this class session, Emily didn't think much about the fact that she benefited from being white.

Emily learned some significant things related to issues of diversity and social justice from the methods course. Related to diversity, Emily came to realize that including different voices was "essential" in teaching social studies. Before the methods course, she thought that including different voices was important, but not "essential." In comparing her ideas before and after the methods course, Emily used the words "enrichment" and "essential." Emily identified reading Takaki's book as one of main factors that made her realize that it is essential to include different voices in teaching social studies. Related to social justice, Emily came to think that making society more just was the purpose of social studies. She stated that addressing social justice issues, especially teaching students how to examine issues that aren't necessarily fair and change what's wrong, is very important in teaching social studies.

Comparisons among the three cases. All three participants showed new understandings about social studies from the methods course, and there were both similarities and differences among them. One similarity among them was that all three participants developed their thoughts about the purpose of social studies, and demonstrated an increased understanding of the value of social studies as a school subject. Also, all three

participants had a new pedagogical recognition in teaching social studies, particularly in realizing the importance of pedagogy for making social studies lessons meaningful or interesting to the students. A difference was that Susanna and Julie demonstrated an expanded scope about what disciplines are included as social studies, while Emily didn't articulate any particular learning in this area.

All three participants showed new learning about diversity. However, while both Julie and Emily expressed some learning in the area of social justice, Susanna did not. Although Susanna read Compton-Lilly's (2004) "Critical Literacy Project," which was related to social justice issues and presented ways to change the students' communities, she didn't connect this with the concept of social justice.

Summary of Analysis of Student Teaching Practices

Figure 5 is a summary of the analysis of the second research question: how do preservice teachers incorporate their learning from the social studies methods course into their actual student teaching of social studies? This summary is divided into three categories: teaching strategies that participants adopted from the methods course, concepts and perspectives that they learned from the methods course, and teaching related to diversity and social justice.

More detailed summaries for each case follow, and then comparisons among the three cases will be discussed in order to show the similarities and the differences among them.

	Susanna	Julie	Emily
Teaching strategies that adopted from the methods course	(a) Used jigsaw for making the lessons interactive (b) Had whole class discussions	(a) Used trade books and integration to make her lessons interesting (b) Employed small group discussion	(a) Used trade books and integration to make her lessons interesting (b) Employed varied teaching methods and activities such as “mini-simulation”
Concepts and perspectives that learned from the methods course	(a) Focused on reasoning instead of memorizing facts in whole class discussion (b) Paid attention to teaching the students to understand what she considered to be “accurate” accounts about Lincoln	(a) Integrated multiple perspectives into one lesson (b) Made connections to modern days	(a) Connected history to students’ lives
Teaching related to diversity and social justice	Provided some study of ethnic/racial diversity in America	Planned and partially implemented discussion of social justice issues	Used trade books to include other cultural perspectives

Figure 5. Summary of analysis of student teaching practices

Summary of the analysis of Susanna’s student teaching practices. Susanna’s full-time student teaching placement was a fifth-grade gifted class in an urban area. During her three-week full time student teaching period, Susanna was given the opportunity to teach two chapters from the social studies textbook. Susanna wanted to use a different approach from that of her cooperating teacher for teaching social studies. Susanna’s cooperating teacher gave students the test package that corresponded to the textbook at the beginning of the week and had them answer the questions by the end of the week as

homework. There was no class time to talk about the textbook, and no test about it. Susanna thought that her cooperating teacher's method did not lead to learning, because she thought the students were just copying answers from the textbook. Therefore, Susanna employed a jigsaw teaching strategy twice, once in each chapter. Susanna said that she adopted this jigsaw method from the methods course when the students used a jigsaw to discuss Takaki's book.

Another teaching method that Susanna employed was whole class discussion. When Susanna led a whole class discussion about the Civil War, she particularly focused on two things, although she usually talked about the important points from the textbook. One was that Susanna emphasized reasoning, instead of simply memorizing facts about the Civil War, asking many "why" questions. This can be attributed to what she had learned from the methods class, through which she changed her previous concept that social studies was primarily fact memorization.

Susanna was also intentional about teaching the students to understand what she considered to be the "real" intentions of Lincoln related to both the Civil War and freeing the slaves. It seemed that studying varying historical accounts of Christopher Columbus had influenced her decision to focus on teaching what she considered to be accurate information about Lincoln. However, because Susanna continued to identify history as having one "truth," she didn't lead her students to see history as interpretative or narrative and to understand that history has multiple perspectives, which the one class session clearly aimed the students to understand this.

In addition to teaching the two chapters from the textbook as a regular social studies class, Susanna also taught a mini-unit titled “American Ethnic and Racial Diversity,” which she adopted from the teacher’s manual titled “The Civil Rights Movement” (1999). Teaching this mini-unit gave Susanna the opportunity to put into practice her desire to spend more time on social studies. Susanna said that this mini-unit provided an opportunity for the students to learn about negative stereotypes about ethnic groups, as well as meeting her original plan for her students to learn about diversity in American society. Susanna was clear that the content of the methods course in the fall semester, especially talking about inequalities in U.S. society and learning about different cultures, had helped her plan and teach this mini-unit.

Summary of the analysis of Julie’s student teaching practices. Julie’s full-time student teaching placement was a sixth grade social studies classroom in a middle school in an urban area. Before Julie started full time student teaching in April, she had the occasional opportunity to teach lessons that her cooperating teacher assigned her to teach. During her three-week full time student teaching, Julie taught a unit on Ancient Rome. Julie prepared this unit by herself, although she adopted several lessons from the *History Alive Curriculum Guide*.

Julie explained that the methods course helped her realize the necessity of using varied teaching strategies for making interesting and meaningful social studies lessons for students, instead creating boring lessons by merely reading the social studies textbook. Based on this new realization, Julie employed varied teaching strategies that she had adopted from the methods course, such as using kid-friendly, easy-to-read trade books as

introductory activity to interest students in Ancient Rome, which proved successful. Another teaching approach that Julie adopted from the methods course was integrating social studies with other subjects. Julie integrated seven of her eleven lessons with other subjects. The other teaching strategy Julie adopted from the methods course was small group discussion. In contrast to her cooperating teacher's over-reliance on independent seatwork, Julie provided small group discussion in several of her lessons, because she thought the students would learn more if they talked about what they were learning. Julie expressed her satisfaction with employing small group discussion, because the students learned how to discuss in addition to learning the content.

Besides adopting teaching strategies, Julie also tried to incorporate several other things that she had learned from the methods course into her lessons. For example, she had the students learn about multiple perspectives in one lesson. Also, based on her new understanding that history is related to modern times, Julie provided the students with opportunities to compare Ancient Rome with modern days in several lessons, although she had some difficulty figuring out exactly how to put this concept into practice. Julie also originally planned to address social justice issues in two lessons in her Ancient Rome unit. However, only one lesson was successful in leading the students to think about social justice issue. She ran out of time to discuss social justice issues in the second lesson.

Summary of the analysis of Emily's student teaching practices. Emily's full-time student teaching placement was a fourth grade classroom in a rural area. Before Emily started full time student teaching in April, she occasionally taught social studies lessons that her cooperating teacher assigned her to teach. During her three weeks of full time student

teaching, Emily taught her unit “Pioneers in Illinois,” which she had prepared using information from the two textbook chapters “The Journey to Illinois” and “Setting Illinois.” Emily also taught several lessons from the textbook chapter “A Time of Troubles.”

On the first day of her student teaching, Emily learned that the students didn’t like social studies. Thus, in preparing her lessons Emily set her own goal of making the students rethink the subject of social studies. In trying to achieve this goal, Emily utilized several teaching strategies that she had learned from the methods course. For example, she integrated her social studies lessons with other subjects, such as writing, art, and science, in her “Pioneers in Illinois” unit. Emily also identified that while taking the methods course, she came to realize she must be concerned about how to deliver her social studies lessons in order to engage the students. Based on this new realization, Emily employed various teaching methods and activities such as games, a mini-simulation, and making posters. Because Emily realized the students were missing the connection between the past and today, Emily used her husband’s family history to make that connection. Overall, Emily’s efforts to make the students rethink social studies were successful at least to some degree.

In addition to teaching strategies, Emily also tried to address issues of diversity and different voices in her lessons. For instance, Emily used a trade book to present a Native American perspective when she covered the Black Hawk War, since she found that the social studies textbook was predominantly focused on the perspective of white European settlers. Also, Emily used trade books to teach the lessons about slavery so that the students could see the slaves’ view.

Comparisons among the three cases. All three participants incorporated aspects of the methods course into their student teaching to some degree. In particular, all of them adopted teaching strategies they had learned from the methods course with the intention of making their social studies lessons either interactive or more interesting to the students. For instance, Susanna employed the jigsaw teaching method and whole class discussion to make her lessons more interactive; Julie employed small group discussion and utilized trade books and integration to make her lessons interesting to the students; and Emily employed varied teaching methods and activities including integration with other subjects and mini-simulation to get the students to like social studies. In sum, all three participants tried to make their social studies lessons interesting to the students.

In addition to teaching strategies, all three participants also tried to teach some concepts and perspectives that they had learned from the methods course in their student teaching. For instance, Susanna focused on reasoning instead of memorizing facts in group discussion, and paid particular attention to teach the students to understand what she considered to be accurate accounts about Lincoln related to civil war; Julie exposed the students to multiple perspectives in one lesson, and tried to make connections between Ancient Rome to modern days; and Emily helped her students understand the fact that history is not merely about dead people, but has a connection to them by utilizing her husband's family history. Clearly, the concepts of reasoning (in Susanna's case), multiple perspectives (in Julie's case), and making connections to modern days (in both Julie's and Emily's cases), which they had learned from the methods class, influenced their student teaching.

All three participants also provided an opportunity for students to think about diversity and social justice, although there were some differences among them. Susanna led the students to study ethnic and racial diversity in American society through a mini-unit on “American ethnic and racial diversity.”; Julie initially planned to address social justice issue in two lessons, although in actual teaching only one lesson was successful; and Emily helped the students learn about different voices by utilizing trade books.

In conclusion, I would like to mention one significant phenomenon that I noticed from my analysis of these preservice teachers’ learning and student teaching practices. During their student teaching, all three participants actually practiced what they described as the most valuable thing that they had learned from the methods course. For instance, Susanna said that she came to realize the importance of social studies as school subject, and wanted to spend more time on social studies lessons. During her student teaching, with the approval of her cooperating teacher, she actually spent more time on social studies by teaching the mini-unit “American ethnic and racial diversity” in addition to teaching from the social studies textbook. Julie identified learning about multiple perspectives as the most valuable thing that she had learned. In her “Ancient Rome” unit, she provided an opportunity for the students to learn multiple perspectives in one lesson. Emily identified her new learning that including different voices is essential in teaching social studies as the most valuable learning from the methods course. During her student teaching, she actually presented different voices such as those of Native Americans and slaves by utilizing trade books.

Chapter 7

Discussion

As the discussion chapter, this chapter has three sections. In the first section, using the concepts of “learning and meaning” and “learning and practice” by Wenger (1998), I will show how his concepts of learning, meaning, and social practice correspond to the three participants’ experiences related to the social studies methods course and their student teaching practices. Then, in the second section, based on the findings of this study, I will provide some suggestions to teacher education, particularly related to social studies methods course and to teaching issues of diversity and social justice. Finally, in the third section, I will provide some recommendations about teacher education program in Korea because this study was evolved from my interests in teacher education reform and in the changing demographics in Korea.

Interpretation of Findings Using Wenger’s Concepts

The purpose of this section is to use a sociocultural theoretical frame to interpret the findings and cross-case analysis from chapter 5 and 6. In particular, I employed the idea of “community of practice” by Wenger (1998) as a tool for this interpretation, particularly his concepts of “learning and meaning” and “learning and practice.” This section, as data interpretation, will show how his concepts of learning, meaning, and social practice correspond to the three participants’ experiences related to the social studies methods course and their student teaching practices. The first part will focus on the concepts of learning and meaning, and the second part will focus on the concepts of learning and

practice. Each part will begin with a brief explanation of the concept, followed by a description of how the concept corresponds to the experiences of the participants in my study.

Learning and meaning. Wenger (1998) is a social theorist of learning whose view focuses on learning as a process of social participation. He primarily relates the matter of learning to the experiences of meaning (p. 5). He suggests:

Learning is first and foremost the ability to negotiate new meaning: It involves our whole person in a dynamic interplay of participation and reification. It is not reducible to its mechanics (information, skills, behavior), and focusing on the mechanics at the expense of meaning tends to render learning problematic. (p. 226)

What his statement about learning above implies is that he clearly opposes a view of learning as merely a matter of the transition of knowledge or skills to the learner. Rather, he considers learning as the matter of how the learner constructs his or her own meaning during the learning process. Thus, he suggests that in educational design, the primary focus should be on the negotiation of new meaning rather than on the mechanics of information transmission and skill acquisition (p. 265). In short, Wenger argues that “meaning is ultimately what learning is to produce” (p. 4), and regards the process of learning as the process of meaning construction by the learner.

His statement regarding the relation between learning and meaning implies that these two are deeply interconnected, and possibly interchangeable. For example, employing his perspective on learning and meaning, my first research question of this study, “What are the influences of a social studies methods course on preservice teachers’ understandings?”

could be replaced by “What meanings did the preservice teachers construct while taking the social studies methods course?”

When Wenger associates meaning with learning, he is interested in “where” meaning is located and “how” it is constituted. Then, he suggests that meaning is located in a process that he calls the “negotiation of meaning” and that this negotiation of meaning involves the interaction of two constituent processes—“participation and reification” (p. 52). His concept of negotiation of meaning conveys his sociocultural approach, emphasizing that “meaning exists neither in us nor in the world, but in the dynamic relation of living in the world” (p. 54).

Wenger uses the term “participation” to describe the social experience of living in the world and active involvement in social enterprise (p. 55), while “reification” refers to the process of giving form to our experiences in concrete ways, such as making, designing, representing, naming, encoding, decoding, recasting, and so on (p. 58). Wenger argues that these two terms, participation and reification, are a duality with dimensions that are inseparable and mutually constitutive elements in the process of negotiation of meaning (p. 66). As such, both elements are always involved, but they can take different forms and degrees.

Wenger suggests that the politics of reification include policies, institutionally defined authority, plans, and designs (p. 92). In my study, reification within the social studies methods course is clearly demonstrated in the course syllabus--in particular, the conceptual framework for the course. The course has five conceptual frameworks—(a) what social studies is; (b) inquiry as a teaching tool; (c) teaching for cultural relevancy; (d)

teaching for social justice; and (e) integrating social studies with different subjects (social studies syllabus, 2007).

The class readings, activities, and assignments constituted a reification of the course reflecting these frameworks. For instance, many inquiry-based projects, such as the inquiry into a school community, the child/lesson study, and the inquiry unit plan, were assigned to help students learn from inquiry experiences. Also, many of the class readings were chosen to provoke students to think about issues of multicultural education and social justice. For example, during the fall semester a book titled *A Different Mirror: A History of Multicultural America* (Takaki, 1993) was provided as one of the class texts so that the students could learn about multicultural immigrant history in America. In addition, the booklist for the literature circles was intended to give students practical experiences with reading and discussing issues related to social justice. The books included: *Because of the kids: Facing racial and cultural differences in school* (Obidah & Teel, 2001), *Confronting racism, poverty, and power: Classroom strategies to change the world* (Compton-Lilly, 2004), *Other People's Children: Cultural Conflict in the Classroom* (Delpit, 1995), and *We can't teach what we don't know: White teachers, multicultural schools* (Howard, 2006). The goal was to help students think about issues of diversity and social justice by discussing these books. Also, other class textbooks, such as *Integrating socially* (Hamston & Murdoch, 1996) and *If this is social studies why isn't it boring?* (Steffy & Hood, 1994) were provided to show practical examples of how teachers integrated subjects when teaching social studies.

However, this reified aspect of the course was only one dimension of the opportunities provided for students to negotiate meaning, as part of their learning process.

Wenger suggests, “to be effective, the politics of reification require participation because reification does not itself ensure any effect” (p. 92). Reification has to be practiced by participants in order for the participants to negotiate meanings for themselves.

All three participants in my study actively participated in the social studies methods course. For example, throughout both semesters, they engaged in reading assignments and class discussion related to the readings. Also, they actively conducted their inquiry assignments and other assignments according to the course syllabus.

Through this actual participation on their part, they negotiated their own meanings about the subject of social studies, but their meanings varied across the three participants. The following two topics—(a) overall understanding about social studies and (b) understanding about the issues of diversity and social justice—will be discussed to show how the three participants producing meanings differently.

All three participants negotiated new meanings about the subject of social studies by participating in the social studies methods course, but each participant constructed a different meaning (See Figure 6).

	Before the course	After the course
Susanna	Social studies is boring	Social studies is important to nurturing citizenship.
Julie	Social studies means history	Social studies is more than history and is multidimensional
Emily	The purpose of social studies is making productive citizens	The purpose of social studies is making the society more just

Figure 6. New meanings of social studies

For example, in Susanna’s case, before the methods course, she thought the subject of social studies was boring, based on her previous experiences with social studies

throughout her schooling. However, Susanna changed her perspective about social studies while taking the methods course. She now thinks that social studies is highly important for helping students become good citizens. In short, Susanna constructed a new meaning about social studies by taking the methods course.

In Julie's case, before the methods course, she regarded social studies as only history-based, although she had taken Economics and Government classes in high school. However, Julie expanded her concept to include politics, economics, and sociology. Julie also saw teaching social studies as multidimensional, including culture, art, and music.

In Emily's case, she negotiated a new meaning particularly related to the purpose of social studies. Even before the methods course, Emily already had her own idea that the purpose of social studies was "making productive citizens." However, by taking the methods course, she expanded her previous idea of the purpose of social studies to "making the society more just" by providing productive citizens.

Also, all three participants negotiated new understandings about the issues of diversity and social justice by participating in the social studies methods course, but each participant constructed a different meaning (See Figure 7).

	Before the course	After the course
Susanna	Had few experience with issues of diversity and social justice	Recognized diversity as different cultures; Not much developed in her thinking about social justice
Julie	Had some educational learning about the issue of social justice	Expanded her understanding of inequities in history and society
Emily	Simply thought different voices are important in teaching social studies	Realized including different voices is essential in teaching social studies

Figure 7. New understandings about the issues of diversity and social justice

For example, in Susanna's case, before taking the methods course, she had few experiences with diversity and social justice throughout her schooling, except, as a Latino, she was personally aware of a language difference. However, by taking the methods course, Susanna constructed a new understanding of diversity as including different cultures. While Susanna solidified her own concept of diversity by taking the methods course, she did not develop her thinking about social justice.

In Julie's case, she had already learned a few things about diversity and social justice during her k-12 schooling, such as the two-day eye color simulation activity that she confessed was an eye-opening experience about issues of diversity and oppression. While taking the methods course, Julie expanded her learning about social justice, especially about the inequity for women in American history by working on developing a group unit plan.

In Emily's case, she clearly stated the new meaning she had constructed in the about issues of diversity and social justice by taking the methods course. Before the methods course, Emily simply thought different voices were important in teaching social studies, but from the course, she constructed a new meaning in which including different voices was essential in teaching social studies to addressing the issues of diversity and social justice. In explaining the difference between her view before and after the methods class, Emily used the words "enrichment" and "essential." Before the course, she merely thought, "If I have extra time, I'll try to include different voices in teaching social studies," but after the class, she thought, "I must include different voices in teaching social studies" (second interview, 2/14/2008).

So far, by adopting Wenger's concepts of learning and meaning, I have shown how the three participants constructed their understandings of social studies and issues of diversity and social justice. Although the methods course instructors set course objectives and goals, these did not simply transfer directly to the participants; rather, each participant, as a learner, negotiated her own meaning from her participation in the course. Each participant's different previous educational experiences influenced her construction of meaning. Wenger argues that the process of negotiating meaning is "dynamic, unique, historical" (p.54). Wenger also suggests, "the primary focus be on the negotiation of new meaning rather than on the mechanics of information transmission and skill acquisition" (p. 265). This theoretical perspective is a useful tool to explain why the three participants in my study arrived at different meanings, although they had taken the same methods course.

Learning and practice. Wenger's concept of the negotiation of meaning implies that the meaningfulness of our engagement in the world is not static, but "a continual process of renewed negotiation" (p. 54). He also states that learning is ongoing, and that significant learning can affect the changes of our practice and the change in our ability to engage in practice (p. 95). In short, significant learning can transfer to other situations, and induce the learner's change in practice.

In my study, all three participants demonstrated that they incorporated things that they had learned from the methods course into their student teaching practice. For example, in Susanna's case, she incorporated her new recognition about the importance of the subject of social studies. By taking the methods course, she came to view social studies as important for helping students become good citizens, and she expressed the necessity of

spending more time on social studies in the school curriculum (second interview, 4/3/2008). During her full-time student teaching period, Susanna spent extra time on social studies by teaching her “American Ethnic and Racial Diversity” unit. Since this unit didn’t have any direct correspondence to the social studies textbook, she had no obligation to teach it, but her new recognition of the importance of social studies contributed to her decision to teaching this unit utilizing spare time.

In Julie’s case, she incorporated her new learning about the necessity of multiple perspectives. Julie said that learning about multiple perspectives in the methods course was the most valuable thing she had learned in the methods course. She realized that no matter what she teaches, she can incorporate multiple perspectives into her lessons (second interview, 2/15/2008). During her student teaching, Julie intentionally taught one particular lesson of her unit “The Ancient Rome” to provide the students with a learning experience involving multiple perspectives. Although Julie adopted the resources from the curriculum guide for this particular lesson, she clearly stated that the idea of studying multiple perspectives came directly from the methods course (e-mail reflection during her student teaching, 4/30/2008).

In Emily’s case, she stated that significant changes occurred regarding the inclusion of different voices (second interview, 2/14/2008). Based on this change, when Emily taught her social studies lessons, she intentionally included Native Americans’ voices and slaves’ voices by using trade books in addition to the social studies textbook, because she realized the social studies textbook was predominantly focused on just white European settlers’ perspectives (third interview, 5/17/2008).

As the examples above show, all three participants in my study demonstrated that they incorporated things that they had learned from the methods course into their student teaching practice. In short, they negotiated meaning while taking the methods course, and then they applied the new meanings to their student teaching practices. Put differently, their newly negotiated meanings were not a static occurrence within the methods course; rather they incorporated them into their student teaching situation.

Wenger states:

The concept of practice connotes doing, but not just doing in and of itself. It is doing in a historical and social context that gives structure and meaning to what we do. In this sense, practice is always social practice. (p. 47)

What Wenger's statement conveys above is his sociocultural approach to practice. His statement implies that practice is not merely an individual thing, but is bounded by a social context. For instance, in my study, while all three participants actually negotiated learning from the methods course into their student teaching situations, they also were bounded by the context of student teaching. As a student teacher, they had to consider the evaluation and consent of their cooperating teacher in whatever they taught. They were often constrained by this context and were not totally free to prepare their lessons in the ways they preferred.

All three participants expressed some difficulties or interferences, which they had to consider given their status as a student teacher. For example, Susanna mentioned that the mandated class schedule in the gifted class, where she had to teach math, writing, and science everyday, constrained her desire to have social studies lessons more often during her student teaching. Julie mentioned that although her cooperating teacher gave her

autonomy in the teaching of social studies, she had to be concerned about her cooperating teacher's attitudes when she used group discussion, since Julie knew her cooperating teacher didn't like group discussion. Also, Emily mentioned her cooperating teacher's objections about teaching about gay and lesbian issues, as she had wanted to do. In short, the social context of their student teaching clearly affected their student teaching practices, as Wenger argues that practice is always social practice.

Suggestions from Findings for Teacher Education

Based on the findings of this study, this section will discuss some suggestions for teacher education, particularly related to social studies methods courses and to teaching issues of diversity and social justice.

First, the findings of this study suggest that student teachers are capable of incorporating not only practical teaching methods but also new theoretical concepts learned from methods courses into their actual student teaching of social studies. In fact, all three participants in this study incorporated things they had learned from the social studies methods course into their student teaching of social studies, both in terms of teaching strategies and new theoretical understandings about the subject of social studies. For instance, they all utilized teaching strategies learned from the methods course to make their social studies lessons interactive and/or interesting to the students. Susanna employed the jigsaw teaching method and whole class discussion; Julie employed small group discussion and utilized trade books and integration; and Emily employed various teaching methods and activities, including a mini-simulation and integration with other subjects.

In addition practical teaching strategies, all three participants also taught in ways that integrated some of the theoretical concepts and perspectives that they had learned from the methods course. For instance, Susanna focused on reasoning instead of memorizing facts in group discussions; Julie exposed the students to multiple perspectives in one lesson, and tried to make connections between Ancient Rome and modern days; and Emily helped her students understand that history is not merely about dead people, but has a connection to them, by utilizing her husband's family history.

Thus, the findings of this study suggest that a social studies methods course that includes theoretical concepts and perspectives can help students change their previous negative experiences about social studies or develop their new understandings about social studies. In short, my data demonstrated that the objectives of the social studies methods course influenced the preservice teachers' use of teaching strategies and theoretical concepts from the methods course.

Second, the findings of this study also suggest that these student teachers had some difficulties incorporating their new learning related to issues of diversity and social justice that they learned from the methods course into their actual student teaching. In fact, although all three participants provided some opportunities for their students to think about diversity and social justice during their student teaching practicum, it appeared that only Emily was strongly committed to teaching about issues of diversity and social justice in her social studies lessons grounded in explicit purpose.

Emily clearly identified including different voices is "essential" in teaching social studies and asserted that making society more just must be the purpose of social studies.

Corresponding to this new learning, she used trade books in order to show her students the perspectives of Native Americans and slaves, which were rarely presented in social studies textbooks, and helped them to think about how is fair if only one's view, in this case only white settlers' view, is presented in history.

In contrast, Susanna and Julie didn't explicitly articulate teaching goals related to issues of diversity and social justice, although they included these issues in their teaching. For example, although Susanna led her students to study ethnic and racial diversity in America through a mini-unit on "American ethnic and racial diversity," she didn't go further to lead her students to recognize the problematic situation of inequalities for minorities in American society. Likewise, although Julie led her students to touch on social justice issues in teaching about Rome in one of her lessons, she didn't go much further in helping the students discuss the problems of unjust situations in ancient Roman society. In short, it seemed to me that during these lessons, they did not place a strong priority in their mind on helping their students discuss or recognize unjust situations in historical or contemporary societies.

One may wonder what factors contributed to the difference between Emily's strong commitment to teaching about social justice issues and Susanna and Emily's partial integration of these issues. As a researcher of this study, I identify their different background experiences before entering the teacher education program at the university as one possible significant factor in terms of their different degrees of commitment to teaching social justice issues. Emily was not a typical teacher candidate in many ways if we realize the fact that currently, most teacher candidates are white females in their early twenties.

Emily was in her early thirties, and has had many life experiences, including living in another country, Germany, during her elementary schooling. In contrast, both Susanna and Julie had had little intercultural experience during their lives, and their lack of experience with diversity may have limited their commitment to teaching social justice, even after attending the methods course. It seems that their teaching practices related to social justice corresponded to the arguments of some researchers that developing a commitment to social justice or multicultural education is difficult for preservice teachers who have had few intercultural experiences (Aaronsohn, 1995; Artiles et al., 2000; Winfield, 1986). Thus, the findings of this study suggest the necessity of giving priority to people who have had intercultural experience in terms of recruiting teacher candidates, if we anticipate more success in helping student teachers develop a commitment to teaching social justice.

Third, the findings of this study suggest the importance of professional development for cooperating teachers, especially related to matters of diversity and social justice. While all three participants in this study stated that they received useful help or support from their cooperating teachers, including teaching strategies, planning teaching schedules, and classroom organization, they also all expressed that they had not received any help in addressing the issues of diversity and social justice. In fact, the interviews with their cooperating teachers showed that their cooperating teachers had little interest in issues of diversity and social justice. They indicated that this was an area where they felt a lack of competence. This seems to reflect one reason why the student teachers did not get much help or support from their cooperating teachers when they tried to address the issues of diversity and social justice in their teaching.

The fact that the cooperating teachers did not feel competent in dealing with issues of diversity and social justice should be regarded as a big problem. Student teachers' teaching practices are likely more influenced by cooperating teachers during student teaching practicum than by teacher education courses in university. Professional development for cooperating teachers could be an important factor in student teacher development in teaching for diversity and social justice. Thus, the findings of this study suggest that professional development for inservice teachers may be necessary if we want student teachers to address diversity and social justice during their student teaching practicum and after.

Recommendations for Teacher Education Programs in Korea

As I mentioned in Chapter 1, since this study evolved from my three interests in the purpose of education, teacher education in Korea, and the changing demographics of Korea, now I also provide some recommendations for teacher education programs in Korea.

Traditionally, the main purpose of schooling in Korea has generally been regarded as the transmission of knowledge to the next generation with a priority on economics. This meant that as a developing country after independence in 1945, Korea needed to have a competent workforce people who had the knowledge and skills to compete with other countries in the modern industrialized world. No doubt, this approach to education has helped Korea become a rapidly developing country economically in the world. However, it has also had a negative impact on Korean society, since many people have not considered

the traditional values in Korea, such as solidarity or helping their neighbors, as a priority over their own wealth.

Corresponding to this economic priority and the transmission of knowledge as the purpose of education, the main aspects of teacher education programs in Korea have also been focused on the “acquisition of knowledge and skills.” In short, the role of teachers and teacher candidates has been regarded as a mere knowledge “transmission belt” (Greene, 1978, p. 38) with not much interest in social problems. Accordingly, unlike the teacher education program in America, teacher education programs in Korea have not provided methods courses for any of the subject matter. The programs have focused only on subject matter knowledge for teacher candidates. The rationale of this approach is simple—if you acquire the necessary knowledge in a certain subject matter, you will not have any problem in transmitting that knowledge to your students. Besides subject matter courses, there have been some foundational courses, including educational administration, educational psychology, and educational philosophy. However, because of the overemphasis on subject matter knowledge, most teacher candidates do not put much priority to these foundational courses.

The student teaching practicum in Korea is considerably shorter than it is in America. The teacher candidates are required to complete four weeks of student teaching internship during their senior year in college. Even worse, it seems to me that this student teaching internship has been too highly ritualized. Student teachers consider it is as a kind of passing ritual to receive their teaching licensure rather than a learning experience. Also, the incumbent teachers often feel it is cumbersome, rather than focusing on providing

thoughtful experiences for their student teachers. Again, the underlying assumption for this short internship period is that if you know the necessary knowledge learned from subject matter courses in teacher education program, then you will not confront any problems in teaching.

Because of the differences between the American and Korean teacher education programs, I acknowledge that the findings of this study cannot simply be transferred to Korea's teacher education program. However, some points from this study can be applied to Korea's teacher education program to make Korea's society more just.

I know that I cannot easily change the current situations related to methods courses in Korea. However, even in the current situation, I think that it is possible to offer a course titled "diversity and social justice" in the foundational courses, and I think now is the time to include this kind course. The content of this course must include assignments that lead the teacher candidates to learn about the changing demographics in Korea and how to make society more just. For example, as in the inquiry about the school community in the methods course in this study, the course could require teacher candidates to visit interracial marriage families and to interview them. I believe this experience would help the teacher candidate better understand the difficulties bicultural families confront.

Another possible assignment that I think would be useful is the use of action research to create real experiences in teaching the children of interracial families. For example, the course could require teacher candidates to teach interracial children at least once a week and to reflect on what they learned, employing the action research method. This could provide the teacher candidate with experiences about how to effectively help

interracial children be successful learners. These are some thoughts that I have now for the “diversity and social justice course” that I would like to offer.

References

- Aaronsohn, E. (1995). Preparing monocultural teachers for a multicultural world: Attitudes toward inner-city schools. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 28, 5-9.
- Adler, S. A. (1991). The education of social studies teachers. In J. P. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning* (pp. 210-221). New York: MacMillan.
- Aguilar, T. E., & Pohan, C. A. (1998). A cultural immersion experience to enhance cross cultural competence. *Sociotam*, 8, 29-49.
- Angell, A. V. (1998). Learning to teach social studies: A case study of belief restructuring. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 26, 509-529.
- Arias, B., & Poynor, L. (2001). A good start: A progressive, transactional approach to diversity in pre-service teacher education. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 25(4), 417-434.
- Artiles, A. J., Hoffman-Kipp, P., & Trent, S. C. (2000). From individual acquisition to cultural-historical practices in multicultural teacher education. *Remedial and Special Education*, 21(2), 79-89.
- Ayers, W. (1994). Skin-game: Race and racism in teaching and teacher education. In J. M. Novak (Ed.), *Democratic teacher education: Programs, processes, problems, and prospects* (pp. 215-228). Albany, NY: State University of New York.
- Banks, C. A. M., & Banks, J. A. (1995). Equity pedagogy: An essential component of multicultural education. *Theory and Practice*, 34, 152-158.
- Banks, J. A. (2001). Multicultural education: Characteristics and goals. In J. A. Banks & C. A. Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (4th ed., pp. 3-30). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Barber, B. R. (1992). *An Aristocracy of Everyone: The Politics of Education and the Future of America*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Barton, A. C. (1999). Crafting a multicultural science teacher education: A case study. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 50, 303-314.
- Berlak, A., & Moyenda, S. (2001). *Taking it personally: Racism in the classroom from kindergarten to college*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

- Bollin, G. G. (1996). Using multicultural tutoring to prepare preservice teachers for diverse classrooms. *The Educational Forum*, 61, 68-76.
- Bondy, E., & Davis, S. (2000). The caring of strangers: Insights from a field experience in a culturally unfamiliar community. *Action in Teacher Education*, 22(2), 54-66.
- Boyle-Baise, M. (1998). Community service learning for multicultural education: An exploratory study with preservice teachers. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 31(2), 52-60.
- Burant, T., & Kirby, D. (2002). Beyond classroom-based early field experiences: Understanding an "educative practicum" in an urban school community. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18, 561-575.
- Cabello, B., & Eckmier, J. (1995). Looking back: Teachers' reflections on an innovative teacher preparation program. *Action in Teacher Education*, 17(3), 33-42.
- Canning, C. (1995). Getting from the outside in: Teaching Mexican Americans when you are an "Anglo." *High School Journal*, 78(4), 195-205.
- Causey, V., Thomas, C., & Armento, B. (2000). Culturally diversity is basically a foreign to me: The challenges of diversity for preservice teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16, 33-45.
- Charmaz, K. (2002). Qualitative interviewing and grounded theory analysis. In J. F. Gubrium & J. A. Holstein (Eds) *Handbook of interview research: Context and method* (pp. 675-694). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication
- Chang, I. (2003). Implications for the reform of Korean teacher education based on multicultural education. *The Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 21, 409-431. (Written in Korean).
- Chasnoff, D., & Cohen, H. (1996). *It's Elementary: Talking about Gay Issues in School*. [VHS]. Studio: New Day Films.
- Clark, C., & Medina, C. (2000). How reading and writing literacy narratives affect preservice teachers' understanding of literacy, pedagogy, and multiculturalism. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51, 63-76.

- Clift, R. T., & Brady, P. (2005). Research on methods courses and field experiences. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. M. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education* (pp. 309-424). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (1995). Color blindness and basket making are not the answers: Confronting the dilemmas of race, culture, and language diversity in teacher education. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32, 493-522.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2001). Learning to teach against the (new) grain. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52, 3-4.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2004). *Walking the road: Race, diversity, and social justice in teacher education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cochran-Smith, M., Davis, D., & Fries, K. (2004). Multicultural teacher education: Research, practice, and policy. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (2nd ed., pp. 931-975). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cockrell, K.S., Placier, P. L., Cockrell, D. H., & Middleton, J. N. (1999). Coming to terms with “diversity” and “multiculturalism” in teacher education: Learning about our students, changing our practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 15, 351-366.
- Compton-Lilly, C. (2004). *Confronting racism, poverty, and power: Classroom strategies to change the world*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Cook, D. W. & Van Cleaf, D. W. (2000). Multicultural perceptions of 1st-year elementary teachers’ urban, suburban, and rural student teacher placements. *Urban Education*, 35(2), 165-174.
- Corbishley, M., & Molan, C. (1997). *Growing up in Ancient Rome*. Mahwah, NJ: Troll Associates.
- Davies, L. (2002). Possibilities and limits for democratization in education. *Comparative Education*, 38, 251-266.
- Deering, T., & Stanutz, A. (1995). Preservice field experience as a multicultural component of a teacher education program. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 46, 390-394.
- Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people’s children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: The New Press.

- Denzin, N. (2001). *Interpretive interactionism* (2nd Edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction of the philosophy of education*. New York: The Free Press.
- Dewey, J. (1927). *The public and its problems*. Chicago: Swallow.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- DeWoskin, R. (2006). *Foreign Babes in Beijing: Behind the scenes of a new China*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Dinkelman, T. (1999). Critical reflection in a social studies methods semester. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 27, 509-529.
- Dinkelman, T. (2000). An inquiry into the development of critical reflection in secondary student teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16, 195-222.
- Emerson, R., Frenzt, R. & Shaw, L. (1995). *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. University of Chicago Press.
- Estrada, K., & McLaren, P. (1993). A dialogue on multiculturalism and democratic culture. *Educational Researcher*, 22(3), 27-33.
- Fehn, B., & Koeppen, K. E. (1998). Intensive document-based instruction in a social studies methods course and student teachers' attitudes and practice in subsequent field experiences. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 26, 461-484.
- Florio-Ruane, S. (1994). The Future Teachers' Autobiography Club: Preparing Educators to Support Literacy Learning in Culturally Diverse Classrooms. *English Education*, 26(11), 52-56.
- Fraser, N. (1997). *Justice interruptus: Critical reflections on the "postsocialist" condition*. New York: Routledge.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Seabury Press.
- Fry, P. G., & McKinney, L. J. (1997). A qualitative study of preservice teachers' early field experiences in an urban, culturally different school. *Urban Education*, 32(2), 184-201.

- Garmon, M. A. (1998). Using dialogue journals to promote student learning in a multicultural teacher education course. *Remedial and Special Education, 19*(1), 32-45.
- Gay, G. (1997). The relationship between multicultural and democratic education. *Social Studies, 88*(1), 5-11.
- Gay, G. (2005). Politics of multicultural teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 56*(3), 221-228.
- Gay, G., & Howard, T. C. (2000). Multicultural teacher education for the 21st Century. *Teacher Educator, 36*(1), 1-16.
- Goodwin, A. L. (1997). Multicultural stories: Preservice teachers' conceptions of and responses to issues of diversity. *Urban Education, 32*(1), 117-145.
- Greene, M. (1978). *Landscapes of learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Greenman, N. P., & Kimmel, E. B. (1995). The road to multicultural education: Potholes of resistance. *Journal of Teacher Education, 46*, 360-368.
- Gutmann, A. (1987). *Democratic education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hammond, L. (2001). Notes from California: An anthropological approach to urban science education for language minority families. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 38*, 983-999.
- Hamston, J., & Murdoch, K. (1996). *Integrating socially: Planning integrated units of work for social education*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Hollins, E. R., & Guzman, M. T. (2005). Research on preparing teachers for diverse population. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. M. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education* (pp. 477-548). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Howard, G. R. (2006). *We can't teach what we don't know: White teachers, multicultural schools* (2nd Edition). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hyland, N. E., & Noffke, S. E. (2005). Understanding diversity through social and community inquiry: An action-research study. *Journal of Teacher Education, 56*, 367-381.

- Jung, M. (2007, August 2). 1.5% are foreign residents. *The Korean Times*, p. E2.
- Kaltsounis, T. (1997). Multicultural education and citizenship education as a crossroads: Searching for common ground. *Social Studies*, 88 (1), 18-22.
- Kaufman, W. (1997). *Life in Ancient Rome*. Mineola, NY: Dover Publications.
- Kanpol, B., & McLaren, P. (1995). Introduction: Resistance multiculturalism and the politics of difference. In B. Kanpol & P. McLaren (Eds.), *Critical multiculturalism: Uncommon voices in a common struggle* (pp. 1-18). Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Katz, S. R. (2000). Promoting bilingualism in the era of Unz: Making sense of the gap between research, policy, and practice in teacher education. *Multicultural Education*, 8(1), 2-7.
- Keiser, D. L. (2005). The right to be equally taught: Three sites of inquiry for social justice at a diverse high school. In N. M. Michelli & D. L. Keiser (Eds.), *Teacher education for democracy and social justice* (pp. 149-163). New York: Routledge.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995a). Multicultural teacher education: Research, practice, and policy. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 747-759). Old Tappan, NJ: Macmillan.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995b). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32, 465-491.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2001). *Crossing over to Canaan: The journey of new teachers in diverse classrooms*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- LaVere, A. (1972). *Black Hawk: Indian patriot*. Champaign, IL: Garrard Pub. Co.
- Lawrence, S. M. (1997). Beyond race awareness: White racial identity and multicultural teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 48, 108-117.
- Lawrence, S. M., & Bunche, T. (1996). Feeling and dealing: Teaching White students about racial privilege. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 12, 531-543.
- Levstik, L. S., & Barton, K. C. (2005). *Doing history: Investigating with children in elementary and middle schools*. (3rd Edition) Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publication.
- Liu, E. (1999). *The Accidental Asians: Notes of a native speaker*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Lucas, T. (2005). Fostering a commitment to social justice through service learning in a teacher education course. In N. M. Michelli & D. L. Keiser (Eds.), *Teacher education for democracy and social justice* (pp. 167-188). New York: Routledge
- MacDonald, F. (2004). *100 things you should know about Ancient Rome*. Bromall, PA: Mason Crest Publishers.
- Malam, J., & Salariya, D. (2003). *You wouldn't want to be a Roman Gladiator*. Danbury, CT: Franklin Watts.
- Marri, A. R. (2005). Building a framework for classroom-based multicultural democratic education: Learning from three skilled teachers. *Teachers College Record*, 107, 1036-1059.
- Marshall, P. L. (1998). Towards developmental multicultural education: Case study of the issues exchange activity. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 49, 57-65.
- Martin, D. S. (2005). Critical thinking for democracy and social justice. In N. M. Michelli & D. L. Keiser (Eds.), *Teacher education for democracy and social justice* (pp. 209-228). New York: Routledge.
- Mason, T. C. (1997 Summer). Urban field experiences and prospective teachers' attitudes toward inner-city schools, *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 29-40.
- McDonald, M. A. (2005). The integration of social justice in teacher education: Dimensions of prospective teachers' opportunities to learn. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 56, 418-435.
- McFalls, E. L., & Cobb-Roberts, D. (2001). Reducing resistance to diversity through cognitive dissonance instruction: Implications for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52, 164-172.
- McIntosh, P. (1990). White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack. *Independent School*, 49(2), 31-36.

- Michelli, N. M. (2005). Education for democracy: What can it be? In N. M. Michelli & D. L. Keiser (Eds.), *Teacher education for democracy and social justice* (pp. 3-30). New York: Routledge.
- Miller, W., & Lucas, C. (1996). *Frederick Douglass: The last day of slavery*. New York: LEE & LOW BOOKS Inc.
- Morales, R. (2000). Effects of teacher preparation experiences and students' perceptions related to developmentally and culturally appropriate practices. *Action in Teacher Education*, 22(2), 67-75.
- Murtadha-Watts, K. (1998). Teacher education in urban school-based, multiagency collaboratives. *Urban Education*, 32(5), 616-631.
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2002). *Professional Standards for the Accreditation of Schools, Colleges, and Department of Education*. Washington, DC: NCATE.
- Nieto, S. (2000). Placing equity front and center: Some thoughts on transforming teacher education for a new century. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51, 180-187.
- Nieto, S. (2004). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education* (4th ed.). New York: Pearson Education.
- Noordhoff, K., & Kleinfeld, J. (1993). Preparing teachers for multicultural classrooms. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 9, 27-39.
- North, C. E. (2006). More than words? Delving into the substantive meaning(s) of "social justice" in education. *Review of Educational Research*, 76(4), 507-535.
- Novak, J. M. (1994). Introduction: The talk and the walk of democratic teacher education. In J. M. Novak (Ed.), *Democratic teacher education: Programs, processes, problems, and prospects* (pp. 1-6). Albany, NY: State University of New York.
- Obidah, J. E. (2000). Mediating boundaries of race, class, and professional authority as a critical multiculturalist. *Teachers College Record*, 102, 1035-1060.
- Obidah, J. E., & Teel, K. M. (2001). *Because of the kids: Facing racial and cultural differences in Schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Oh, S. (2005). A case study on the growing of Kosian children and its social environment. *The Journal of Korean Education*, 32(3), 61-83. (Written in Korean).

- Olmedo, I. (1997). Challenging old assumptions: Preparing teachers for inner schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13, 245-258.
- Parker, W. C. (2001). Toward enlightened political engagement. In W. B. Stanley (ed.), *Critical issues in social studies research for the 21st century* (pp. 97-118). Greenwich, CN: Informtionage.
- Parker, W. C. (2003). *Teaching democracy: Unity and diversity in public life*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Peterson, K. M., Cross, L. F., Johnson, E. J. & Howell, G. L. (2000). Diversity education for preservice teachers: Strategies and attitudes outcomes. *Action in Teacher Education*, 22(2), 33-38.
- Powell, R. (1997). Then the beauty emerges: A longitudinal case study of culturally relevant teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13, 467-484.
- Pothoff, D. E., Dinsmore, J. A., Stirtz, G., Walsh, T., & Ziebarth, J. (2000). Preparing for democracy and diversity: The impact of a community-based field experience on preservice teachers' knowledge, skills, and attitudes. *Action in Teacher Education*, 22(1), 79-92.
- Rethinking Schools (1998). 10 Quick ways to Analyze Children's Books for Racism and Sexism. *Rethinking Schools Special Edition*. 3-5.
- Rodriguez, A. J. (1998). Strategies for counterresistance: Toward sociotransformative constructivism and learning to teach science for diversity and for understanding. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 35, 589-622.
- Rushton, S. (2001). Cultural assimilation: A narrative case study of student-teaching in an inner-city school. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17, 147-160.
- Schultz, A. (2001). John Dewey's conundrum: Can democratic schools empower? *Teachers College Record*, 103, 267-302.
- Siedl, B., & Friend, G. (2002). Leaving authority at the door: Equal-status community-based experiences and the preparation of teachers for diverse classrooms. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18, 421-433.

- Sikula, J. (1996). *Handbook of research on teacher education: Project of the association of Teacher Educators* (2nd ed.). New York: Macmillan Library Reference
- Sleeter, C. E. (2001). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools: Research and the overwhelming presence of whiteness. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52, 94-106.
- Sleeter, C., & Bernal, D. D. (2004). Critical pedagogy, critical race theory, and antiracist education: Implications for multicultural education. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (2nd ed., pp. 240-258). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Smith, D. (2002). *If the World Were a Village*. Toronto: Kids Can Press.
- Social Studies Syllabus (2007). *Social studies syllabus*. University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, IL.
- SooHoo, S., & Wilson, T. C. (1994). Control and contradiction in democratic teacher education: Classroom and curriculum approaches. In J. M. Novak (Ed.), *Democratic teacher education: Programs, processes, problems, and prospects* (pp. 163-182). Albany, NY: State University of New York.
- Southerland, S. A., & Gess-Newsome, J. (1999). Preservice teachers' views of inclusive science teaching as shaped by images of teaching, learning, and knowing. *Science Education*, 83(2), 131-150.
- Stachowski, L. L., & Mahan, J. M. (1998). Cross-cultural fields placements: Student teachers learning from schools and communities. *Theory Into Practice*, 37(2), 155-162.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The Art of Case Study Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Steffey, S., & Hood, W. J. (1994). *If this is social studies, why isn't it boring?* York, Maine: Stenhouse Publishers.
- Stewart, D. (2006). *You wouldn't want to be a Roman soldier*. Danbury, CT: Franklin Watts.
- Takaki, R. (1993). *A different mirror: A history of multicultural America*. Boston: Little, Brown & Co.
- Teachers' Curriculum Institute (1999). *The Civil Rights Movement: Twentieth Century United States History*. Palo Alto, CA: Teachers' Curriculum Institute.

- Tellez, K. (1999). Mexican-American preservice teachers and the intransigency of the elementary school curriculum. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 15, 555-570.
- Tiezzi, L. J., & Cross, B. E. (1997). Utilizing research on prospective teachers' beliefs to inform urban field experiences. *Urban Review*, 29(2), 113-125.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The Development of higher psychological process*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wade, R. C. (1999). Voice and choice in a university seminar: The struggle to teach democratically. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 27, 70-92.
- Wade, R. C. (2001). Social action in the social studies: From the ideal to the real. *Theory Into Practice*, 40, 23-28
- Wah, L. M. (Producer/Director). (1994). The color of fear [Film]. (Available from Stir Fry Productions, Oakland, CA).
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Wenglinsky, H. (2000). *How teaching matters: Bringing the classroom back into discussions of teacher quality*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004). What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 41, 237-269.
- Wiest, L. R. (1998). Using immersion experiences to shake up preservice teachers' views about cultural differences. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 49, 358-365.
- Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (1998). *Understanding by design*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Wiggins, R. A., & Follo, E. J. (1999). Development of knowledge, attitudes, and commitment to teach diverse student populations. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 50, 94-105.
- Wilson, C., & Davidson, R (2005). Developing a shared vision for schooling and teacher education in a democracy. In N. M. Michelli & D. L. Keiser (Eds.), *Teacher education for democracy and social justice* (pp. 189-207). New York: Routledge.

- Winfield, L. F. (1986). Teacher beliefs toward academically at risk students in inner urban schools. *The Urban Review*, 253-268.
- Wolk, S. (1998). *A democratic classroom*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Xu, H. (2000). Preservice teachers integrate understanding of diversity into literacy instruction: An adaptation of the ABC's model. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51, 135-142.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Zeichner, K. M. (1993). Connecting genuine teacher development to the struggle for social justice. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 19, 5-20.
- Zeichner, K. M., & Hoeft, K. (1996). Teacher socialization for cultural diversity. In J. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (2nd ed., pp. 525-547). New York: Macmillan.

Appendix A
Protocol for First Interview

A. General family background and education background

(a) Family background

- Would you briefly tell me where you are from and your family background?
- What are the important values that your parents emphasized as you were growing up?

(b) Educational experiences before coming to the university

- What were your educational experiences in K-12 schooling? Overall positive learning experiences or not?
- Can you describe your relationships with teachers and friends?
- In retrospect, what school year was the most significant or which year do you have the most memories about in your schooling? Why?
- In what ways did you learn about issues of diversity or social justice in your K-12 schooling?
- Did you participate in extracurricular activities? If yes, which ones?
- What experiences influenced you most when you were thinking of becoming an elementary school (middle school) teacher?

(c) Experiences with social studies in K-12 schooling

- What was it like for you to learn social studies in elementary school?
What was the focus of the content of social studies in elementary school?
- What was it like for you to learn social studies in middle or high school? What was the focus of the content of social studies in middle or high school?
- Overall, to what extent did you like social studies in K-12 schooling, say from 1 (worst) to 5 (greatest)? Why?
- Prior to this teacher education program, and also before taking the social studies methods course, what would you have said were the 2-3 major reasons why elementary (middle) students should learn social studies compared to other subjects?

B. Learning from the 16-week social studies methods course in the fall

(a) Overall learning from this course

- Overall, what was it like to take this course? What made this social studies methods course unique, compared to other methods courses?
- What kinds of learning experiences from this course were significant or important for you?

- In your opinion, what was one of the most significant course objectives of this course? What does that course objective specifically mean to you?

(b) Assignments and activities

- What assignments or activities were most valuable in this course for effectively teaching social studies when you become a teacher?
- What did you learn from each inquiry?—inquiry 1 (community study), inquiry 2 (crossing borders), and inquiry 3 (child study)?
- What was your focus/concern when you prepared your unit plan?
- Among the books and other readings, which one was most meaningful to you? Why?

Appendix B

Protocol for Second Interview

- A. Learning from the 5-week social studies methods course in the spring
 - (a) Thinking about the 5 weeks of the social studies methods course in the spring, what kinds of learning experiences were new to you? Were there any significant things that you learned from this course?
 - (b) Would you specifically talk about what you learned from each topic—for example, white privilege, practicing democracy, addressing controversial issues & current events, media literacy, bilingual issues, and history museums?
 - (c) For the literature circle, which book did you read and what did you learn from that book and that activity?
- B. Learning from the social studies methods course across both semesters
 - (a) Thinking about the social studies methods course over the course of both semesters, personally or professionally, what aspects do you consider most valuable? Why?
 - (b) Thinking about the social studies methods course over the course of both semesters, what aspects do you consider least valuable or you don't like?
- C. Current ideas about teaching social studies
 - (a) After taking this course, in what ways have you changed (or not changed) your ideas or perspectives about teaching social studies? For example, now what do

you think the purposes or goals of social studies in elementary (middle school) students should be?

- (b) Compared to other subjects, such as language arts, math, or science, what particular value do you attach to the subject social of studies?
- (c) When you teach social studies to elementary (middle school) students, what would be your 2 or 3 overarching foci? What aspects or issues will you focus on? Why?
- (d) What general constraints or challenges do you think you may face in teaching your social studies subject?

D. Perspectives on issues of diversity and social justice

- (a) What are your perspectives or ideas about the issues of diversity, equity, and social justice?
- (c) Would you draw a symbol, sign, or picture that might best represent your vision of diversity and social justice?
- (c) How are you going to address the issues of diversity and social justice when you teach social studies? Do you have specific examples or topics that you have thought about?
- (d) What specific constrains or challenges do you think you may face in teaching these issues?

E. The 5-week student teaching placement

- (a) During these five weeks of student teaching, what were the most beneficial things that you learned, in general, and for teaching social studies?
- (b) During these five weeks of student teaching, what were some of your difficulties, in general, and in teaching social studies?
- (c) Do you have any ideas for when you teach social studies during your upcoming student teaching? What will be your goals, what issues will be highlighted, or what possible challenges do you foresee in teaching social studies during your student teaching?

Appendix C

Protocol for Third Interview

A. General student teaching experience

- (a) What were your personal and professional expectations about student teaching *before* starting this 10-week of student teaching?
- (b) In retrospect, to what extent did your experience meet your expectations? Say, 1 is LEAST and 5 BEST. Why?
- (c) What was the most valuable learning experience from this student teaching period?
- (d) Do you have any memorable stories related to teaching, classroom management, or students? Or related to your cooperating teacher or school culture?
- (e) What were some difficulties or challenges during this period of time?

B. Social studies teaching experience

- (a) What was your major focus/emphasis when you taught your social studies lessons?
- (b) How did you incorporate teaching strategies and/or your learning from the social studies methods course into your actual social studies lessons?
- (c) In particular, what was it like for you to deal with or teach the issues of diversity and social justice in your social studies lessons?
- (d) To what extent do you think you have changed your perspectives in addressing these important issues of diversity and social justice? How have you changed, if

at all? (If you feel you have not changed your perspectives much, then what are some reasons that you didn't?)

(e) If you were to redo this teaching experience, what things would you do differently to see some explicit change from your experience?

Appendix D

Protocol for Interview with Cooperating Teacher

A. Questions related to the cooperating teacher

- (a) Why did you become an elementary (middle school) teacher?
- (b) How long have you been teaching?
- (c) Would you tell me about the demographics of your classroom and the school?
- (d) How many times have you had a student teacher?
- (e) What do you think is the most important role of an elementary (middle school) teacher?
- (f) Why do you think elementary (middle) students should learn the subject of social studies? In other words, what is your goal for teaching social studies to your students?
- (g) What are your perspectives about the issues of diversity and social justice in education? If possible, give me some concrete examples.

B. Questions related to the student teacher

- (a) What are your goals for helping your student teacher grow?
- (b) How do you feel about your relationship with your student teacher?
- (c) In your opinion, what is strength of your student teacher as a teacher?
- (d) In your opinion, what a concern or weakness for your student teacher as a teacher? How have you helped her to develop in that area?
- (e) In retrospect, what was an overarching emphasis your student teacher made in

teaching the subject of social studies? Did she show any tendency to emphasize certain content, contexts, or methods? On which aspects did your student teacher focus when she taught the subject of social studies to the students?

(f) In what ways did your student teacher address the issue of diversity and social justice in the context of teaching social studies and/or other subject areas?

Would you please give me the title/topic of a lesson or unit of study in which she dealt specifically with diversity or social justice?

(g) Regarding preservice teacher education, do you have any suggestions for university instructors or the teacher education program?

Appendix E

Syllabus of Social Studies Methods Course

Course Titles:

C & I 448 Teaching Elementary Social Studies (Fall, 2007) &

C & I 447 Issues and Practices in Addressing Diversity in Elementary Education (Spring, 2008)

Required Course Materials

Hamston & Murdoch. Integrating Socially.

Levstik & Barton. Doing History.

Steffey & Hood. If This Is Social Studies Why Isn't It Boring?

Takaki, R. A Different Mirror: A History of Multicultural America.

About the Course:

Social Studies education as an area of study in the elementary school curriculum seeks to develop and encourage the knowledge and skills necessary to participate in a democratic society and in a increasingly interdependent world as present and future citizens. It is also an approach to education that emphasizes the active process of “study”—that is, inquiry into the social world in which we live. This course has been designed to connect theory and practice of teaching social studies through the processes of inquiry and production (the creation of pedagogical practices). In an integrated, two semester sequence, we will

examine the content and teaching aspects of social studies and also address issues of diversity, equity and quality in all children's learning.

Weekly Schedule C & I 448 Fall 2007

Session	Topics	Readings/Assignments
1. Aug. 23/24	Course Framework Interviewing Peers Social Studies Experiences How to "read" history/Takaki	
2. Aug. 30/31	What is Takaki's purpose in writing history? What does it mean to be "American"? Inquiry-based learning What is a "concept"? Explanation of Inquiry # 1	Takaki, Chapter 1 Integrating Socially, Chapter 1 Parker, "Teaching concepts"
3. Sept. 6/7	What should be learned in Social Studies? National Standards/State Goals What does the current political context mean for social studies?	Boring, Intro & Chapter 1 Doing History, Chapter 1 Zinn, "Why study history?" Web materials on Islam/Arab Stereotyping
4. Sept. 13/14	Inquiry begins with questions Essential Questions/ Enduring Understandings Present Inquiry # 1	Boring, Chapter 5 Doing History, Chapter 8 Inquiry # 1 Your School's Community
5. Sept. 20/21	Exploring Historical Perspectives through Inquiry Unit Planning—Different Approaches	Zinn, "Columbus, the Indians, and Human Progress" Boring, Chapter 14 Doing History, Chapter 6
6. Sept. 27/28	Unit Planning—Organizing by Questions Whose story is history? Introduction to Literature Circles	Doing History, Chapter 3 Integrating Socially, Chapters 2 & 4 Boring, Chapter 7 Begin Inquiry # 3
7. Oct. 4/5	"Race" as a socially constructed category How can "long ago" be real?	Takaki, pp. 21-23, Chapters 2 & 3 Review material on <u>The Tempest</u>

	Using trade books to show perspectives	Doing History, Chapter 2 Edinger, “Long Ago: Imaging the Pilgrims”
8. Oct. 11/12	Unit Planning: Preparing to Inquire Revolution! Using non-fiction	Boring, Chapter 12 Doing History, Chapter 9 Hubbard, “Lesson Study” Do Inquiry # 2 by this date
9. Oct. 18/19	Concepts, Topics, and Themes in Units Unit Planning: Finding Out— Collecting and Organizing Information	Boring, Chapter 12 Takaki, pp. 79-83, AND Choose Chapter 4, 5, OR 6 Inquiry # 2, Discussion of Crossing Borders
10. Oct. 25/26	Unit Planning: Making Connections Social Sciences: Geography and Sociology How do we think/teach about other places in the world?	Takaki, Chapter 7 OR 8 Boring, Chapters 4 & 11 Tarry’s Unit: Windows on the world Inquiry #3—Child/Lesson Study
11. Nov. 1/2	Social Sciences: Economics and Political Science Can there be economic justice? Using simulations/role plays	Boring, Chapter 9 Takaki, pp. 225-227 AND Choose from Chapters 9, 10, OR 11
12. Nov. 8/9	Textbook units Oral history Personal and family history	Takaki, Chapters 12 OR 13 Doing History, Chapters 4 & 5
13. Nov. 15/16	Civil Rights and Civic Responsibility Unit Planning—Taking action Using primary sources—Teaching with documents	Takaki, pp. 373-377 & Chapter 14 Boring, Chapter 3 & 15
Nov. 19-23	Thanksgiving Break	
14. Nov. 29/30	Justice, Peace, and Perspectives Social Studies and English Language Learners (I)	Doing History, ?Chapter 11 Boring, Chapter 13
15. Dec. 6/7	Unit planning fair	Arrange time/place with instructor

Weekly Schedule C & I 447 Spring 2008

Session	Topics	Readings/Assignments
1. Jan. 17	Organize and begin Literature Circles* White Privilege Brainstorming for final project	Intro and 1st chapter of Literature Circle Book (read before class) Boring, Chapter 6
2. Jan. 24	Practicing Democracy: Addressing Controversial Issues & Current Events GLBT issues—"It's Elementary" video Class work on media literacy	Boring, Chapter 8 Doing History, Chapter 10 Read either Parker, "Democratic citizens" or Harwood/Hann on Controversial Issues
3. Jan. 31	The Arts in Social Studies/Centers activity Bilingual/ESL issues in social education	Doing History, Chapters 12 & 13 Choose one from Weisman, Brown, or Szpara articles
4. Feb. 7	History Museums/possible walking field trip to "Spurlock Museum" on campus Social Studies In and On other places/Global Citizenship	Doing History, Chapter 7 Trofanenko, "Displayed Objects" Boring, Chapter 2
5. Feb. 14	Literature Circle Presentation and Discussion Course Evaluation	Sharing of work on Social Learning Applications

*About ½ hour of every subsequent class session will be devoted to literature circle meetings.